

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY  
AND  
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.

---

EDITED BY  
J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D.,  
PROF. J. H. GOOD, Tiffin, Ohio.  
AND  
REV. J. H. KLEIN, D.D., Louisville, Ky.

---

VOL. VII.—1874.

---

LANCASTER, PA.  
FEARSOL & GEIST, PRINT, 22 SOUTH QUEEN STREET.



# CONTENTS.

JANUARY.	PAGE.	
The Enduring World, - - -	1	
Aspirations, - - -	6	
The First Helvetic Confession on Baptism, - - -	8	
The Divided House; or, the Two Tendencies, - - -	14	
Remarkable Condition of Things in Europe, - - -	18	
Evading Issues, - - -	23	
The Pope on Protestantism in Rome, - - -	28	
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		
The Schaff Literary Society, - -	29	
The Spirit on Discovery, - -	30	
Family Religion, - - -	34	
The Mission of the, German Races, - - -	38	
College Items, - - -	40	
Editors' Desk, - - -	42	
Book Notices, - - -	45	
Monthly Summary, - - -	47	
FEBRUARY.		
The Liturgical Question, - -	55	
Immanuel, - - -	65	
Watchman, What of the Night? -	70	
The Evangelical Alliance and Lancaster, - - -	73	
The Divided House; or, the Two Tendencies, - - -	77	
More Evasions, - - -	81	
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		
The United States in History, -	87	
Eulogy—Milton, - - -	91	
College Items, - - -	94	
Editors' Desk, - - -	95	
Book Notices, - - -	99	
Monthly Summary, - - -	99	
MARCH.		
We Have an Altar, - - -	109	
The Liturgical Question, - -	114	
Jesus, the Perfect Man, - -	123	
Dorner on Nevinism, - - -	129	
Dr. Schneck's Book on Mercersburg Theology, - - -	138	
Has it Come to This? - - -	142	
An Allegory, - - -	144	
The Awakening in Edinburgh and London, - - -	146	
		PAGE.
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		
The Golden Rule, - - -		148
The Centennial, - - -		157
Current Items, - - -		154
Editors' Desk, - - -		157
Book Notices, - - -		160
APRIL.		
Christ our Life, - - -		165
The Liturgical Question, - -		170
The Heidelberg Catechism and the Apostles' Creed, - -		177
Whence the Tares? - - -		183
What Manner of Spirit? - -		188
Sailing Under False Colors, -		191
What Is It? - - -		195
The Mercersburg Review Against Itself, - - -		201
Doubtful Morality, - - -		206
Should Professors in a Reformed Seminary Advocate and Teach Ref'd or Lutheran Doctrine? -		209
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		
The True Idea of Education, -		212
Zwinglian Literary Society, -		217
College Items, - - -		218
Editors' Desk, - - -		220
Book Notices, - - -		222
Monthly Summary, - - -		225
MAY.		
Christ our Life, - - -		229
The Liturgical Question, - -		235
Jesus the True and Only Priest, -		243
Are the Foundations Safe? - -		248
?, - - -		251
Cries for Peace, - - -		253
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		
Influence of Habit on Moral Character, - - -		257
The Divine and the Human, -		261
Special Items, - - -		265
Editors' Desk, - - -		266
Book Notices, - - -		270
Monthly Summary, - - -		271
JUNE.		
Born of the Spirit, - - -		285
The Liturgical Question, - -		289
Our Creed, - - -		294
Reply to Dr. Gerhart's Card in the Messenger, - - -		299
Schism—Heresy, - - -		304



	PAGE.		PAGE.
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		Book Notices, - - - - -	491
Education in India, - - - - -	308	Monthly Summary, - - - - -	492
Special Items, - - - - -	313	Miscellaneous Items, - - - - -	493
Religious Instruction, - - - - -	317	OCTOBER.	
Editors' Desk, - - - - -	323	Fellowship with the Father, -	501
Book Notices, - - - - -	326	Fellow-helpers to the Truth, -	507
Monthly Summary, - - - - -	327	"I am for Peace," - - - - -	513
JULY.		Alleged Fabrication, - - - - -	524
Dissimulation, - - - - -	333	Thus Saith the Lord, - - - - -	528
The Liturgical Question, - - - - -	338	Gerhart on Baptism in Conntry	
Dr. Schneck in the Messenger,		Papers, - - - - -	531
in 1851, - - - - -	346	URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
Foul Play and a Losing Game, -	351	The Immateriality of the Soul, -	538
Taking to the Water, - - - - -	356	Our Standard of Scholarship, -	542
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		Editors' Desk, - - - - -	548
Biennial Address before the		Book Notices, - - - - -	551
Literary Societies of Ursinus		Monthly Summary, - - - - -	553
College, - - - - -	361	NOVEMBER.	
The English Classics, - - - - -	367	"Access unto the Father," - -	557
Commencement Week, - - - - -	370	Things to be Remembered, -	563
Editors' Desk, - - - - -	383	Dr. Gerhart and his Card, -	566
Book Notices, - - - - -	385	Jesuits and Jesuitry, - - - -	573
Monthly Summary, - - - - -	388	Puseyism, - - - - -	579
AUGUST.		Dr. Dorner on the American	
The Minority Report, - - - - -	389	Churches, - - - - -	584
"The Faith," - - - - -	401	URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
Strife-Makers, - - - - -	405	Liberal Education, - - - - -	589
Unjust Criticisms of Dr. Schneck's		College Monopolies, - - - - -	594
Book, - - - - -	407	How we Learn, - - - - -	597
Dr. Gerhart's Explanation, -	411	Scientific, Literary, &c., - -	598
The Ursinus Union, - - - - -	414	Elementary Instruction, - - -	599
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		The Laplanders and the Arabs, -	600
Salutatory—No Man Lives to		Precious Stones, - - - - -	601
Himself, - - - - -	416	A Newly Discovered Nation, -	602
Steadfastness and Strength, -	421	Special Items, - - - - -	603
Special Items, - - - - -	431	Editors' Desk, - - - - -	604
Editors' Desk, - - - - -	437	Book Notices, - - - - -	609
Book Notices, - - - - -	441	Monthly Summary, - - - - -	611
Monthly Summary, - - - - -	442	DECEMBER.	
SEPTEMBER.		Jesus Emmanuel, - - - - -	613
Sowing and Reaping, - - - - -	445	Fellowship with Jesus, - - -	619
The Primitive Faith Concerning		Reformed Confessions—How	
God, - - - - -	445	to obtain them, - - - - -	620
Selections on Faith, - - - - -	451	The Frederick Appeal Case, -	625
What Is It? - - - - -	453	A Cry for Help, - - - - -	631
Political Aggressions of the		Puseyism, - - - - -	636
Papacy, - - - - -	457	Tired of Controversy, - - -	640
Gerhart on Baptism, in the		I Feel it Pull, - - - - -	643
Country Papers, - - - - -	461	URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
Betraying with a Kiss, - - - -	464	Learning to Think, - - - - -	644
The Heidelberg Catechism in its		Special College Items, - - -	652
Historical Sense, - - - - -	469	Various Items, - - - - -	653
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		Editors' Desk, - - - - -	655
Our Location, - - - - -	472	Book Notices, - - - - -	661
History Philosophically Viewed	477	Monthly Summary, - - - - -	661
Special Items, - - - - -	482		
Editors' Desk, - - - - -	483		



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—JANUARY, 1874.—No. 1.

---

THE ENDURING WORD.

It is the word of the Lord. Speaking of *it*, a prophet of the Old Testament declares, "it shall stand forever;" and an apostle of the New Testament, quoting and endorsing the declaration, boldly says, "it endureth forever." Both evidently affirm the same truth, teach the same doctrine.

That truth is *the eternal and unchangeable stability of the Word of God*. It was true in the days of Isaiah, the son of Amos, seven hundred and twelve years before Christ. It was true when Peter, the son of Jonas, wrote his epistle about sixty years after the birth of Christ. During those *eight centuries*, there had, doubtless, been development in the clearer apprehension of the blessed truth, but the *truth itself* remained essentially the same. The form in which it was uttered had changed. Isaiah proclaimed it in Hebrew, Peter preached it in Greek. But, whether in Hebrew or in Greek, the substance remained unchanged. Isaiah 40: 6-8; 1 Peter 1: 24, 25.

Both Isaiah and Peter affirm the enduring stability of the Word of God, *in contrast with the changeable and perishing nature of all things earthly*.

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; all flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field." Every Summer and Fall teach this impressive lesson. Every revolving year confirms it. All seasons in their course summon us to earnest consideration of the solemn fact. Even earth's arbor vitæ die, and her strongest, as well as fairest sons and daughters, though



they may reach fourscore and ten, at last must bow to the inexorable law of their mortality.

And as all flesh is grass, so *all fleshly thoughts*, and *schemes*, *theories* and *conceits* of men, are transitory and perishable. When they first spring up they may be green as grass, and "spread themselves like a bay-tree." They may seem fair as the stately magnolia, and be fragrant as the almond-blossom. Nevertheless, they are but grass and flowers. Hard as they may struggle to perpetuate themselves, "the breath of the Lord passeth over them," and blows them away like withered leaves, or like broken chaff. Even though *like parasites* which twine about an oak, they seek to fasten themselves to the tree of life, the winter of God's displeasure will blight them, so that they will fall again to their kindred earth to be "trodden under foot of men," and be forgotten. "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," this will be their proper "*organic*" doom!

But "the Word of the Lord endureth forever." No contrast could be more strongly expressed, or more strikingly set forth. Nor could the lessons taught by the contrast be more impressively inculcated. Of all things we can see or grasp, grass and flowers are among the most frail and perishable. "In the morning they grow up and bloom; in the evening they are cut down and wither." Of all things created which men behold and admire, mountains and stars are the most permanent and unchanging. Nebo, Sinai, Tabor, Lebanon, stand to-day as when the patriarchs beheld them, or prophets stood upon their summits. "The sweet influences of the Pleiades, and the bands of Orion," have lost none of their power or strength since the day when afflicted Job was cheered by the contemplation of them as symbols and proofs of the wisdom, might and faithfulness of God.

Grass and flowers in their utter frailty are emblems of the glory and the pride of man, in *his* works and words.

Mountains and stars are emblems of the steadfast enduring nature of the works and Word of God.

#### *The Word of the Lord.*

What is meant in Sacred Scriptures by the phrase? To what are the qualities of endurance and stability to be applied?

In common language, a *word* is a sign or symbol of a thought. It is the expression by speech or writing of a conception which



before lay silently in the mind. Hence it is, in some sense, a *revelation* of what was previously hidden in the heart.

This does not limit the meaning of the term strictly to a *single* word. For the term may be, and often is, used collectively of a greater or less number of such words, employed to express the whole mind of the person speaking or writing, in regard to the matter in hand. In this sense the entire law, and even the whole Bible, is called "The Word of the Lord."

The more nearly or fully a *word* used answers to the thought it is meant to express, the greater is its perfection. Among human speakers and writers, those are considered the best who show the most power and skill in using words which most clearly and accurately express their thoughts. As a rule, it is their own fault, if men professing to be learned, say or write what intelligent and honest people cannot understand, or what they are accused of misunderstanding.

Whether a word is *spoken* or *written* makes no difference in regard to its real import and value, as the expression of a truth or a fact. Neither does it make any difference as to the real *power* and *authority* of the word, so far as it may possess such power and authority.

God has been pleased to make His mind and will known in both ways. With His own finger He wrote His word of commandments on the two tables of stone. In the expressive language of a living author, "They were God's *autograph*." Indeed, a greater part of the Bible is His word in this two-fold form. It was first spoken, and then written, by His command and will.

Some have overlooked this fact in their zeal to maintain some favorite theory, and have falsely made a great difference between God's word spoken and God's word written. But the Psalms, the epistles of the New Testament, though *written* for use, under the enlightening guidance of the Holy Spirit, are as inspired, as divine, as authoritative and sacred, as any words which were, in the first place, spoken.

Is the wonderful prayer of our Lord, in John 17, any the less wonderful, holy, comforting for His people, for being known to them only in its written form? When He said to the wrapt apostle on Patmos: "To the angel of the church of Ephesus WRITE," was the solemn message to be received with less rever-



ence and teachableness of humility than if John had been sent to bear it by word of mouth?

"The Word of the Lord," therefore, includes all that God has revealed to men, making known to them whatever He thought needful for them, and wished to make known in regard to matters concerning their true well-being for time and eternity.

It is His word so far as the facts and truths thus revealed are made known directly by Him, and "proceed out of His mouth." And it is His word, also, so far as the *language* used to make known those facts and truths was employed under the influence and guidance of His spirit. It is *His* in emphatic distinction from man's, and in being, in all essential and important respects, as far above man's thoughts and words as the heavens are above the earth. All the truths, facts, doctrines, promises, and threatenings of the Bible, are God's word to man.

These all find their highest consummation, their clearest revelation and most amazing exhibition in Jesus Christ, "the Word made flesh," "the true light" of the world. As all God's words point to Him as their chief object, so they find their highest expression and most perfect completion in Him.

The Word of the Lord, therefore, is the *truth* which He has made known to men, "at sundry times, and divers manners," and especially through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord. This Word or truth we are assured,

*Shall Endure Forever.*

How is this promised endurance or stability of the Word to be understood?

1. What God revealed and commanded to be taught as truth thousands of years ago, shall forever remain such in all its essential features. Other things may change with the ever-varying mutation of earth and time, but the truth of God shall not so change. It taught Abraham to call God by the very word or name by which we are taught to address Him, and that word or name reveals the same God to us whom it revealed to him. It taught Enoch substantially the same way of acceptable access to God in worship, (Hebrews 11: 5, 6,) by which it leads us to Him, and encourages us to take that way with the same promise.

In all fundamental respects the theology of the book of Genesis is the same as that of Revelation; and the Gospel by John may be



found in Leviticus and in the Psalms. The faith of the Patriarchs after the flood was substantially the same as that of all who truly believed in God before the flood. The waters of that dreadful judgment swept away all else, but the Word of the Lord remained. Noah and Abel worshipped the same God, and essentially by the same rules.

From the very beginning of the revelation of divine grace to fallen man, men were taught by the Word to hope for salvation through a mediatorial propitiation, a vicarious sacrifice. They are taught the same way of salvation now.

Progressively clearer revelations of that immutable truth have been granted to men; and progressively fuller apprehensions of that truth may mark successive ages. But the essential truth itself abides immutable forever.

2. As His eternal truth the Word of the Lord shall be forever preserved and upheld against all the assaults of error, and "oppositions of science, falsely so-called." Such assaults and oppositions have arisen in times past, and continually arise. Instead of accepting with humble gratitude what God has kindly taught them, men of every generation have withstood the divine authority of the truth, even "as Jannes and Jambres resisted Moses." In the pride and vanity of their minds they "would be wise, though born as the wild asses' colts." And sometimes, for a season, such errors seem to triumph. A Caiaphas could sway the Sanhedrim, and have those who preached the Gospel cast into prison. An Arius could carry the Synod of the Eastern church with him, and have defenders of evangelical truth banished into exile. But the Word of the Lord has more than survived all such seeming defeats, and triumphed over every foe. Error, vanquished in one form, may be subsequently revived in another form. It may seek to deceive by putting on all manner of disguises. It may stealthily get into the very citadel of the truth, secure the keys of its gates, and with such advantages fraudulently obtained, appear to have ensured its success. But the Lord will take care of His Word, and has both wisdom and power to defend and maintain it. And He has sworn that *it shall endure forever*.

It will be easy to draw some important

*Practical Lessons*

from this divine pledge of the enduring stability of the Word of the Lord.



1. How vain and perverse are the attempts of men to remove or change the truth of God. Such attempts may, in some sense, be honestly made. That is, men may think themselves right in going wrong, they may mistake the errors of their own blinded reason for the truth. But this does not relieve them of blame, or justify their folly. Above all, it will not, it cannot save them from ultimate defeat and shame. When the fancied light of their reason has been exposed as darkness, when the floating bubbles of their vain philosophies have one after another burst, and when all their profoundly learned theories have been confounded by what they now disdainfully reject as "the foolishness of God," they will discover to their self-reproach and shame, that whilst all flesh is grass, the Word of the Lord (which they despised) endureth forever.

2. The childlike confidence of the true, simple-hearted believer, rests upon a sure and enduring foundation. He has every reason to "stand fast in the faith," not allowing himself to be driven about by every changing wind of doctrinal novelties devised by men. Amidst all the contentions forced upon the true church by the assaults and machinations of error, his mind and heart can rest in the comforting assurance, that "the Word of the Lord" is His everlasting truth, and that in spite of the most subtle or violent hostility of error, it "shall endure forever."

Let these thoughts be our consolation at the opening of another year, and bear us hopefully through all its toils and trials. Years pass away. Man fails. Earth changes. But God's Word of truth, of promise and of grace shall abide the same forever.

---

#### ASPIRATIONS.

O, that the pinions of a clipping dove  
 Would cut my passage through the empty air ;  
 Mine eyes being sealed, how would I mount above  
 The reach of danger and forgotten care !  
 My backward eyes should ne'er commit that fault  
 Whose lasting guilt should build a monument of salt.

Great God, that art the flowing spring of light,  
 Enrich mine eyes with Thy refulgent ray :



*Aspirations.*

7

Thou art my path; direct my steps aright;  
I have no other light, no other way:  
I'll trust my God, and Him alone pursue;  
His law shall be my path, His heavenly light my clue.

---

Eternal God! O, Thou that only art  
The sacred fountain of eternal light,  
And blessed loadstone of my better part,  
O Thou, my heart's desire, my soul's delight!  
Reflect upon my soul, and touch my heart,  
And then my heart shall prize no good above Thee;  
And then my soul shall know Thee, knowing love Thee;  
And then my trembling thoughts shall never start  
From Thy commands, or swerve the least degree,  
Or once presume to move, but as they move in Thee.

---

In having all things, and not Thee, what have I?  
Not having Thee what have my labors got?  
Let me enjoy but Thee, what further crave I?  
And having Thee alone, what have I not?  
I wish not sea, nor land; nor would I be  
Possessed of heaven, heaven unpossessed of Thee.

QUARLES.

---

Fount of light, of joy, and peace,  
To thy living waters lead me—  
Thou from earth my soul release  
And with grace and mercy feed me;  
Bless Thy word that it may prove  
Rich in fruits that Thou dost love.

Kindle Thou the sacrifice,  
That upon my lips is lying;  
Clear the shadows from mine eyes  
That, from every error flying,  
No strange fire within me glow  
That Thine altar doth not know.

B. SCHMOLCKE.

---

With fifty years between you and your well-kept wedding vow,  
The Golden Age, old friends of mine, is not a fable now.

J. G. WHITTIER.



## THE FIRST HELVETIC CONFESSION ON BAPTISM.

WHEN men quote from the Confessions of the Reformed church to substantiate their modern theories, they ought to be careful above all to quote and translate correctly. In an excellent article in the *Reformed Church Monthly* of November, page 575, (which is certainly a complete reply to the theories of Mr. Rupp,) the writer is puzzled by a quotation which Mr. Rupp professes to make from the First Helvetic, because of his inability to find it. To set this matter right, we propose now to show :

1. That said quotation is not contained at all in the First Helvetic Confession.

2. That it is wrongly translated, so as materially to change its teaching on the subject of Baptism.

3. We will give a full translation of what the First Helvetic and the other document teach on the subject of baptism ; which will show how very little support they give to the modern theory.

1st. We have read over the whole of the First Helvetic Confession composed in 1536 (which is quite short, about 12 pages,) and find no such language used in it. What it does say concerning the sacraments and baptisms, we give in full below. In the years 1536 and '37 (not in 1757) the same Swiss cities that united in the First Helvetic Confession, entered into a correspondence with Dr. Martin Luther, for the purpose of explaining their position, and it is in one of these letters to Luther that the passage occurs which Mr. Rupp attempted to quote.

2d. But his translation is decidedly and materially defective, as will become apparent when we give both side by side. The error of Mr. Rupp occurred, by making use of a defective English translation, and not going back at once to the original. The whole strength of his argument rests upon the defect of the translation ; correct his translation, and the whole argument at once tumbles down.

## RUPP'S TRANSLATION.

"Baptism is a sacrament wherein the Lord, by a visible sign, doth testify this grace unto us, *whereby he doth regenerate us, and cleanse us from our sins*; and also receive us to be his

## THE CORRECT TRANSLATION.

"Baptism is a Sacrament, wherein the Lord, by a visible sign, doth testify and set forth his grace, *namely, that he regenerates us, cleanses us from sin*, receives us to be his people, which peo-



*The First Helvetic Confession on Baptism.* 9

people, that we may live to Christ, die to the old Adam, and be partakers of the good things of Christ.

"Therefore, just as we do, and always did receive these sentences of Scripture touching the ministry of the Lord, namely: The minister doth convert, remit sins, open the eyes and hearts of men, give faith and the spirit; so, being well understood, we do acknowledge also these sentences touching the sacraments, namely: *The minister, through baptism, doth regenerate and wash away sins*; he doth distribute and present the body and blood of the Lord."—Declaration of the Former Helvetic Confession, A. 1757.

ple now are to live unto Christ, and die to the old Adam, and become partakers of all the benefits of Christ.

"Therefore, as we<sup>u</sup> before willingly accepted, and are always willing to allow *the modes of speech* concerning the ministry of the Lord, when it is said that the ministers convert the people, forgive them their sins, open their hearts, and such like; so also *we may allow, in the proper understanding thereof*, that men should say, the minister regenerates and washes away sin through Baptism, and in the Supper doth give the body and blood of the Lord, &c."—(Let the reader note what a great difference in sense is given by a correct translation.)

3d. We will now give a full translation of what the two documents teach concerning the Sacraments and Baptism, and the intelligent reader can judge whether they sustain Mr. Rupp or not.

"XXI. The signs which in the church of Christ are called Sacraments, are two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; these symbols of invisible benefits consist not in mere signs, but in signs and the things signified. For in Baptism, water is the sign, but the thing itself is regeneration and reception among the people of God. In the Supper, bread and wine are the signs, but the thing is the communion of the body of Christ, his accomplished salvation and the forgiveness of sins; *which, nevertheless, are received through faith*, as the signs are received with the mouth, and in the thing itself rests the whole fruit of the Sacrament. Therefore, we affirm, that the Sacraments are not only certain marks of Christian fellowship, but also pledges of the grace of God, through which the minister co-works with the Lord to that end which he promises, offers and works; yet so, that as we have before said of the ministry of the Lord, all saving power is to be ascribed to the Lord alone."

"XXI. Baptism is, according to the institution of the Lord, the font of regeneration, *which the Lord offers to his elect* in visible signs, through the ministry of the church, as said above. To this holy laver of water we bring our children for this reason,



because it would be unjust to separate from the communion of the people of God those born of the people of God, to which communion they are already called by the Word of God, especially since we may believingly presume their election."

*The Letter to Martin Luther.*

"We will now also give our view of the Holy Sacraments. The Holy Sacraments are *visible pictures, sure testimonies, and holy remembrances* of God's grace and promise toward us; which, under earthly visible signs, represent unto us and place before our eyes heavenly gifts, and also withdraw our hearts from the earthly things and point to the heavenly; they are also tokens of Christian unity and fellowship. According to this, a Sacrament is not the mere sign alone, but every Sacrament has an earthly visible sign and a heavenly essential thing which is signified and represented; and although both make but one Sacrament only, yet it is one thing which is received with the body outwardly, and another thing which the believing heart receives, being instructed by the Spirit of God. For the holy signs, and the heavenly things which are signified thereby, *are not otherwise united and together, except according to the mode of Sacraments*, some call it "Sacramental union;" which is as much as to say, that the sign and the things signified, are not united so that the one becomes the other naturally, or that the one is in or included in the other; for each, as also holy Gelasius acknowledges, preserves its nature and property. Therefore, the outward signs are not essentially and naturally that which they signify, nor do they give it out of themselves or their own power; as little as the minister does, but the Lord makes use of the minister and the signs, as also the Lord, to this end, that out of His mere grace, *when and how He will* (yet always according to His promise), He doth *represent, declare, and visibly announce* and *set forth* His heavenly gifts.

As now it does not derogate anything from the ministry of the Word of God, when it is said that the outward preaching of the Word doth not help or profit anything, except God give the increase and growth in the heart; for Paul says, (1 Cor. 3: 7.) "So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase;" so also he doth not derogate anything from the Sacrament who says the visible signs do not purify, but God himself; that is, he doth not despise and dishonor



the holy Sacraments who ascribes all power and saving operation to the Creator ; for Peter has said (1 Pet. 3 : 21) " Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." For, as in other creatures, (as in the sun, moon, stars, fire, precious stones, herbs, and such like) through which God works as instruments, we should not place our confidence in them, nor regard them as the original causes of the benefits which we experience through them ; *so also we should not place our confidence in the outward signs, although they are holy things instituted of God, and which God uses toward us.* Also, the glory of God should not be ascribed to them, as such, but through them our faith should rise from the earthly to the heavenly, to God the Creator and origin of all things, and also of the Sacraments.

Since now the Sacraments are the institution and work of the Lord, believers will take and receive them, not as an unnecessary and purely human thing, as if given by men's hands, but as heavenly gifts from the hands of the Lord ; for, of the outward Word which Paul preached, he said, (1 Thes. 2 : 13,) "When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." So is it also with the Sacraments.

Therefore, as we before willingly accepted, and are always willing to allow *the modes of speech* concerning the ministry of the Word, when it is said that the ministers convert the people, forgive them their sins, open their hearts, and such like ; so also *we may allow, in the proper understanding thereof,* that men should say, the minister regenerates and washes away sin through Baptism, and in the Supper doth give the body and blood of the Lord. For Ananias says to Paul, (Acts 22 : 16,) "Arise, and be baptised, and wash away thy sins." Also of the Supper it is said, (Matt. 26 : 26,) "Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, take, eat ; this is my body," &c. *Such modes of speech* the ancient fathers also made use of the more gloriously to commend the gifts of God and His goodness.

But since the service of the Word and the Sacraments is an institution and work of God and not of men, we renounce the Anabaptist and Donatist error which esteems and measures the



Sacraments according to the worthiness or unworthiness of the minister.

But that the heavenly gifts *are represented* through earthly signs, comes to pass through the special goodness of God, *who desired by this means to assist our weakness*; for our weak understanding apprehends every thing much better if represented by visible things. Therefore, as respects His promise and heavenly gifts, the Lord has wished to write them, as it were, upon a tablet by visible signs, *i. e.*, he has delivered to us in visible signs that which alone can be understood and apprehended with the heart. Therefore, we conclude that the Sacraments are appointed for those who are in the Christian church; those who are without and godless, scoff at our Sacraments, for they judge them according to the external form; but believers penetrate further into the Sacraments, and understand their institution and effect.

Those now who receive the Sacraments with true living faith, receive them with fruit; when received without faith they injure. Not that the good gifts of God do hurt in themselves, but that not being used with faith and rightly, they do hurt through our default.

Further, the Sacraments are also badges of the people of God, through which we are gathered, received, and enrolled in the church and among the people of God, and confess our faith. For it has pleased God in this way to gather for Himself a people, and to mark them with definite signs, thereby also to remind them of their duty. Of these Sacraments there are two in the church of Christ, namely, Baptism, which is called "the washing of regeneration," (Titus, 3: 5,) and the Supper, which is called "the body and blood of the Lord," or "the communion of the body and blood of the Lord," (1 Cor. 10: 16;) of both of which we will now speak, and explain our views. For thus far we have treated of Sacraments in general, according to the Scriptures, as we confess them before God; and hope assuredly that herein nothing will be found wanting by you (Luther) and yours.

*Baptism* is a sacrament, wherein the Lord, by a visible sign, doth testify and set forth His grace, namely, that He regenerates us, cleanses us from sin, receives us to be His people, which people now are to live unto Christ, and die to the old Adam, and become partakers of all the benefits of Christ. For we are all conceived and born in sin, therefore it is necessary that we be born again



and cleansed from sins, which comes to pass through the mercy of God, which he bestows upon us through free grace, unmerited on our side; through which grace God takes us up into his covenant, and endows us with the Spirit of Christ his Son, in order that being buried with Him into his death, we may arrive unto a new life; which is treated of more fully in the doctrines of the holy apostles. But such heavenly gifts are given and bestowed upon us, to speak truly; in no other way than by the goodness of God, which makes use of the Sacrament, to this end, *to declare to us such things, and to bring them before our outward senses and apprehension, to incite us and exhort us to hear*, so that all glory may be to God, but also that hereby the holy institution of the sign may not be despised and emptied; for Peter says truly and correctly, "Baptism saves us," but adds at once, "not the putting away the filth of the flesh." And John the Baptist says, (Matt. 3: 11,) "I indeed baptise you with water unto repentance; but He that cometh after me . . . shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." This was also regarded by the holy fathers, who were assembled in the council of Nice, when they said, "the Baptism of Christ is not to be contemplated with bodily, sensible eyes, but with the eyes of the mind."

Besides this, Baptism is also a badge of the people of God, for it serves as our confession. For by baptism we confess and acknowledge in the church of what faith we together with our children are, namely, of the Christian faith, members of a body whereof Christ is the head, to whom we are subject, and by whom we have been received into the number of His servants, as such who under His guidance and under His banner are to contend through the whole life against the world, the flesh and the devil.

In looking over the above *carefully* and *impartially*, the reader will please to notice how very easy it would have been for the Swiss to say to Luther, in almost every paragraph, that "Baptism is the instrumental cause of regeneration," and "the only way by which God regenerates men," *if such had been their meaning.*

J. H. G.

---

GENEROSITY during life is a very different thing from generosity in the hour of death; the one proceeds from liberality and benevolence, the other from pride or fear.—*Horace Mann.*



## THE DIVIDED HOUSE ; OR, THE TWO TENDENCIES.

“ And every house divided against itself shall not stand.”

We invite the thoughtful readers of the *Monthly* to the actual condition of the Reformed church. We do so without any feeling of the partisan—without being an alarmist—even without having any desire to make a sensation. If it shall appear that the Reformed church, as it regards its internal state, is a divided house, it will surely awaken unusual concern in the minds of those that love her. Before her suffering and wrongs, every feeling but that of love must give place, and her children should seek to bind up her wounds and restore her integrity. It has been an easy matter to tear, rend and divide the church of our fathers; but how shall union and peace be restored to her communion. Here lies a difficult work that appeals to the undismayed courage of her sons, trusting in Christ the head. If aliens have rent her to gratify a thirst for novelty, or a desire for place and room for ambition, let some one in whose veins flows blood that was shed in martyr days undertake to reunite our now dissevered family. Let some one having the right and the requisite gifts of God, sound a bugle call that will remind of Alpine ancestry and freedom, and rally all that love the ancient faith together around the glorious standard of the Reformation.

We shall appeal for what we have to say about the fact of a divided house, and those who rent it, to the accredited history of the church, as it is contained in the records of her highest courts. We shall not resort to partisan statement, but to the unquestioned facts that mark her course during the last few years. It was during many years denied by *some* of the watchmen placed on the towers, that any danger existed to the welfare and peace of the church. It was falsely asserted, even within a very few years, that quiet reigned, and that all alarm was created by a few noisy ciphers, or a dissatisfied faction not to be regarded as an integral part even of the church. But those who so persistently strive to blind and deceive the too confiding people, have now been compelled to admit what is a sad fact. Our purpose is to *satisfy* the honest, thinking reader, of the true state of the Reformed church, and that it is now an “authorized” fact not to be gainsayed, that there is bitterness and division in our Zion. It will be necessary for this end, to retrace the action of the controlling majority in our



*The Divided House; or, The Two Tendencies.* 15

higher church courts, in order to settle this point definitely—that we are a *divided* house—that it was felt long before its admission, and that traces of this consciousness are to be found during the time that the *Messenger* was pleased to deny it and denounce those who so asserted, as slanderers.

It need not be related here how a *controlling* majority was created in the higher church courts that stood united, and with a high hand carried out all their divisive plans. This may be, and we expect to show that all this was done by a faction that had not and now has not carried with it, in their disruption of the church, its judgment or its heart, but had, by adventitious means, not the most honest or sacred, got hold of power. It has been done under the pretense of veneration for and return to the ancient Reformed faith, and by the most solemn protestation that no innovation was intended, and no division could ensue.

That the Reformed church is a divided house, is declared by the General Synod held at Cincinnati, in December, 1873, in two separate and distinct affirmations, both drawn up by members of the *faction* that has for the last twenty-five or thirty years, with a harsh and imperious hand controlled the courts of the church. One may be found on pages thirty-one and thirty-two of the minutes, and in the words of Dr. Gerhart, of the Lancaster Theological Seminary, author of Tract No. 3, on Baptism, a most pronounced ritualist and an abettor of the Mercersburg Theology in its extremest views. Here are the words: "In conclusion, the committee feel constrained to make explicit reference to the difference of sentiment, touching worship and some points of doctrine that prevails in the Reformed church. That there are two tendencies, was distinctly recognized by the General Synod of Philadelphia. This division of sentiment has ripened into antagonism, the adherents of one tendency being arrayed in their practical church work directly against the adherents of the opposite tendency. Whilst the present state of things exists there can be no unity, peace, and concord. Instead of concentrating our energies in the way of harmonious action against the common foe, much of our time and strength is expended in maintaining the conflict within our own organization, and in seeking to achieve victory—one tendency victory over the other." No sharper picture of a divided family than this can be drawn. Not only difference of sentiment on vital doctrine, but antagonism in practical



Christian activity, to an extent that paralyzes the work of the church against the common foe of Christ's church.

That this is a correct statement of fact, we now appeal to record number two, found on page thirty-seven, in the words of Dr. Bausman, of Reading, Pa., who also takes side with the imperious faction who have arrogantly called themselves *the church* and *the Synod*. Hear him : "We need not inform this venerable body that the unsettled state of the church, the exciting and irritating controversies agitating her, have seriously interfered with this part (home missions) of our church work."

This is confirmatory of Dr. Gerhart's statement, that the difference on doctrine in the church is so great in the fundamental facts of our faith, that the two tendencies in the church cannot work together—not even in the home mission field. It is evident that the tendencies are farther separated and more antagonistic than in some of the several denominations of our country. After these solemn utterances are adopted by the General Synod, it will not do for the *Messenger* and Dr. Nevin, or the theological followers that affect his manners, to say that it is only a faction of ciphers that are set up in their ignorance against *the church*, or "Dr. Nevin and the rest of us." It has become too serious a matter for this, and after the composition of the General Synod at Cincinnati is seen, the fact is patent that if there be a faction in the case, it is with those who have attempted to set aside the old Reformed doctrine.

But let us all pursue our retracing course three years further to the General Synod at Philadelphia, and there we shall find the ground on which the two several parts of this divided house stand. This deliverance, too, comes from a member of the dominant faction, whose hand has been so offensively heavy on the church. It is the declaration drawn up by Dr. T. G. Apple, another of the professors in the seminary at Lancaster. It may be found on pages forty-six and forty-seven. It is on the adjustment of the claim of two rival liturgies differing in doctrine, and in the extent of their use. "We do not believe that the church is prepared to unite on any one now. The only possible course it seems to us is to allow the question to work out its results in a *free* way, and, therefore, no trammels should be put upon the matter in any direction. Of course, there are certain limits within which the General Synod should keep the movement. It should be guarded



*The Divided House; or, The Two Tendencies.* 17

from danger and from evil. But within these limits we think the church should allow a certain amount of difference to prevail."

Here the occasion of the division is given in two tendencies growing out of two systems of doctrine and usages found in two rival liturgies. This General Synod, controlled by the followers of Dr. Nevin, Ritualistic and semi-Popish in their view, gives free course to their rival doctrinal tendencies, although they have again and often asserted that one was tending toward Puritanism, Fanaticism, and Ritualism. While they were charged with tending to Pantheism and Romanism, no trammels should be put on the matter in any manner or direction. Both may follow whither it pleases them to tend, "in a *free* way." A saving clause of Synod's authority is put in, but it is to be noted that with their positive majority they never place any limits to these tendencies. We are just then to hold the General Synod that recognizes two tendencies in the church, and gives them unfettered right to develop themselves, responsible for all and every result. If one ends in fanaticism and infidelity, that Synod has allowed it. If the other ends in Romish idolatry, it also permitted it. If the diverging tendency of these antagonistic liturgies divided the church, the Synod at Philadelphia allowed it, and said it was *free* to do so. From this there is no logical escape. The minority in that Synod proposed to limit the range of these tendencies of doctrine and usage by interposing the formal consent of the consistory and the congregation to their introduction into the regular services of the church. This was voted down, and the minister was allowed to override the consistory and the congregation, and drive in the wedge of division in the shape of a liturgy, whose doctrine and usages the consistory and the congregation abhorred. There remains no shadow of doubt but that the difference and the antagonism complained of at Cincinnati was not only allowed but given untrammelled room to effect itself by the Ritualistic Mercersburg majority at the Synod of Philadelphia, that would permit no limit to be put on these tendencies.

ULRIC.

(*To be continued.*)

---

THREE things appear to be uninjured by the fall: the song of birds, the beauty of flowers, and the smile of infancy.

## REMARKABLE CONDITION OF THINGS IN EUROPE.

As the *Reformed Church Monthly* enters upon a new year with this issue, it cannot but be appropriate to take a survey of the state of things in Europe, as this is in the highest degree interesting and full of portents for the future, both in the sphere of church and state. We know not whether this will effect us directly in America, as we are, in a measure, a community by ourselves, and independent of movements in the old world. Still, we must remember, that for the present yet, Europe is the beating heart of the world, and the centre of Protestant movements. America may have the promise of the future, but it were vain-glorious to affirm that for the present the spiritual forces of the world do not have their fountains in Europe.

D'Israeli is reported to have affirmed lately in a speech, that he could not see how a deadly conflict between church and state could be averted in Europe, and that he predicted we were on the eve of a general European war, based upon these as underlying historical forces. Such a judgment from such a man, ought to have due weight. D'Israeli has been prime minister of England, and is therefore well acquainted with the secret currents of political forces that flow hither and thither in the sea of the European state system.

The complicated state of affairs in Europe, at this juncture, is a direct outgrowth of the now celebrated infallibility dogma promulgated from Rome a few years ago. Taken in connection with the Ultramontane affirmations and projects of the papacy, and looking at its ulterior purposes, that decision has been regarded as intended to affirm the supreme authority of Rome, or the Roman church (or Jesuitism, since Jesuitism is now the church of Rome) over all the states, peoples, kings, emperors, and even the civilization of modern Europe. This called forth, first, indignation at the audacity of promulgating such a dogma, at war with all Scripture, all sound reason and history. Indignation, further, that in this nineteenth century it should be assumed to be possible to carry into actual practice such a dogma. Next, dread, lest with the undeniable power which the Roman church in Europe still holds over the masses, this dogma might be made use of to turn back the civilization of the age into the lower plane of an age long since past.



*Remarkable Condition of Things in Europe.* 19

No one can reflect thoughtfully on the great events that have transpired in the political sphere in Europe since the promulgation of this dogma, without being impressed with the thought that providence, in its overruling of the affairs of the world, is clearly against Rome in its present position. A series of surprising and unexpected events have followed that dogma, thus far entirely nullifying its power, and even threatening the overthrow of the papacy itself, as a power in the world. That which was intended to make strong the papacy, has made it weak and almost contemptible.

Then (three years ago), Catholic power was immensely great in Europe. Not only did it control the majority of the population, but it had great civil powers to sustain it by concordats, by the sword, and by traditional agreements. France until then the leading power of Europe; Austria, Spain, Bavaria, Naples, and lesser powers, were the long and powerful arms made use of by the Roman chair to carry out its plans. Stupendous revolutions followed. Prussia overcame Austria, put itself at the head of Germany, and paved the way for the Italian king to enter Rome. Germany, now united under Prussia, overcame France, and became a Protestant empire under Kaiser Wilhelm. Rome, no longer helped by France, became stripped of its political power, and thus unable to carry out the decree precisely in that sphere in which it was most anxious to carry it out, and in which it could only be carried out by the aid of its civil allies, all of which it had practically lost.

In this posture of affairs, we have now arrived at the year 1874, with Rome still conscious of its great power with millions of people standing face to face with the state, as embodied in the German empire, and D'Israeli thinks that a general armed conflict cannot be avoided in the near future; a conflict that *may* have all the characteristics of a religious war, and that may draw into its whirlpool the greater portion of the continent.

It is not to be disguised, that all over Europe the Jesuits are working industriously to call forth such a conflict. Will they be able to succeed?

In the German empire they are carrying on a sharp struggle with Bismarck and the government. Thus far Bismarck has been triumphant at every point. The great influence of his name, as the creator of the German empire, and of the unification of Ger-

many, has thus far carried him safely through the contest. But evidently the battle is not yet ended. Jesuitism is yet a power, even in Germany. In Italy their machinations are directed towards undermining the throne of King Emmanuel, and in attempting to call in foreign powers to intervene for the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope.

It is plain that they have been specially active in France within the last few months, by setting on foot numerous and imposing pilgrimages and processions, intended to fire the heart of Catholic France, if possible, to plunge it into another war with Germany and Italy, and to force a Catholic king (Chambord) upon the throne now vacant, and thus prevent the permanent establishment of a Republic. In one of these pilgrimages, more than seventy members of the Parliament of France attended in a body, and speeches and prayers were made for the restoration of the Pope to his temporalities by armed force. They were very nearly successful, as is well known, in putting Chambord upon the throne. We have little doubt, from all that we have read, that the secret programme was somewhat of this kind. Put a Catholic king upon the throne of France. Let France put itself at the head of the Catholic masses of Europe for the restoration of the Pope, and the carrying out of the infallibility dogma. Spain, with its feeble republic, can soon be brought to rally under the white flag of France. Intervention in Italy will drive the Piedmontese King from Rome, and, perhaps, restore a Bourbon to Italy. Crusades can be organized by the same appliances and pretended miracles that organized pilgrimages. Austria and the Catholic states of Germany can be influenced and brought into line. And so, by plotting and intriguing, all that has been lost in the last five years, can in the next five years be regained.

For, it must be remembered, that apparently all that the Pope needs in Europe just now, *is a nation to take the lead* in this crusade, (this time, not for the tomb of the Lord, but for the exaltation of the usurper of His throne), and such a leader at this time Rome has not, and cannot find. Turn which way he may, the Pope cannot find one. France could be such a leader, but, under Thiers, or McMahon, or the Republic, it cannot take that position. Austria might be such a leader, but for the present it has a liberal tendency, away from the absolution of Rome. Even Spain or Italy would do, but the governments in both cases are



against the pretensions of the Pope. So it is with Bavaria also. Belgium and Portugal are too insignificant to take such a place.

The leadership of the great power now standing in antagonism to the Papal party, belongs to the German empire—a mighty power called into being within a few years. There is not yet an armed conflict, but a hand-to-hand conflict between Bismarck and the Pope. In this contest, the former has had to resort to unusual and even dangerous measures; measures which we cannot commend in themselves, or endorse from a Scriptural stand-point, and that can only be justified by the singular position in which matters stand in Europe. The imposing of the infallibility dogma upon the Catholic church by an ignorant set of bishops, has compelled the State (or States) in self-defence to resort to these dangerous measures. The actual circumstances of the alliance of Church and State in Europe, has forced the latter to resort to extreme measures, to thwart the equally extreme assumptions of the former. Not only have the Jesuits been actually banished, and their establishments broken up, but general laws have been passed by which the State claims and will exercise the right of appointing or rejecting all ministers of the Gospel, and of deciding upon their qualifications. These laws are un-Scriptural, as we think, and they are contrary to the well-established principles of the Reformed church from the beginning. It is to the honor and credit of the Reformed church, that from the first it affirmed the autonomy of the church, its right to self-government in all respects. To affirm that the State can decide what education and qualifications a minister must have, is contrary to Reformed principles. It degrades the ministerial office to a mere secular profession, and makes a given quantity and sort of education the qualification for the ministerial office—an error that is often held by persons in this country also. On the contrary, we hold that the Lord calls His ministers, and by His word points out what qualifications must be at hand, (and they are not merely, or chiefly, *educational*), and of these qualifications the church, and not the State, must be the judge. Each congregation must call its own minister. The laws of Bismarck are, therefore, dangerous in principle, and may become as dangerous for the Protestant church in the future, as they are now intended to be powerful against Jesuitism.

To-day peace reigns outwardly, and apparently, in Europe.

Germany is successful as against the Papal power. We devoutly hope it may continue to be so during this decisive year 1874. But let it be noted, that this state of affairs may be suddenly changed by events that may be, and probably are, very near at hand.

In the first place, the Emperor Wilhelm, a noble and heroic man, almost an ideal of a good Christian ruler, is a very old man, upwards of eighty years of age. In the natural course of events, he cannot be expected to live long. His death may very materially change the nature of the contest and the aspect of affairs. The Crown Prince is known to have little sympathy with Bismarck and his measures. He is said to be rationalistic in his views; at least he has confided the education of his children to a rationalistic minister. He may not have the same pious, orthodox, personal faith, as his father, as a basis against the Ultramontanism of Rome. This accession to the imperial throne may give quite a different character to the contest.

Again: Bismarck is also an old man. The personal magnetism and genius of the man have thus far been a tower of strength as over against Rome. But, upon his death, it is very doubtful whether Germany can put a man in his place who will carry out to consummation the present measures of the empire.

Still further. Matters in France are not yet so consolidated as to afford any assurances of permanency. It is generally agreed, that it was only the obstinacy of Chambord which prevented his ascension to the throne. A new crisis, a new revolution, some slight turn in the course of events, may commit France to a crusade for the Papal power.

Even Spain may receive an Ultramontane king, who may raise the cry of arms in behalf of the Holy See. Any of these four events may break upon the world any day of the present year. The elements are ripe in Europe for a general religious war for a death conflict between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, as at present represented respectively by Bismarck and Pius IX.

The feeling that such a contest may be precipitated any day, is said to be widely diffused in Germany, and lies at the basis of the increased and increasing emigration from that country to America.

Let us be thankful that in America we are not, and cannot be, involved in this conflict. Here, Church and State live and labor peacefully side by side (to a great extent, at least.) May it ever so continue.

J. H. G.



EVADING ISSUES.

THE Lancaster Faculty has felt constrained to reply to the article entitled, "*Not to the Point*," published a month ago. It is to be regretted, however, that the reply fails to appreciate or meet the issue joined. On the contrary, it is exceedingly evasive throughout, however unconscious the writer may have been of the fact.

This evasiveness appears even in the opening sentences of the reply. It says the writer of the article *expresses his pleasure at the manner* in which we (Lancaster) explained our theory of historical development. Now the fact is, that the writer of the article in question, did the very opposite of this, as any one reading it could see and feel. It was because the Lancaster Faculty *had not* explained its theory at all; but for a purpose of its own, had taken another tack, that the article "*Not to the Point*" was written. The very title of the article shows this.

Again, when he says that the writer of the article asks Lancaster to *defend* its theory of historical development more distinctly, he evades the point made. What the article demanded was, that Lancaster should explain, if possible, the glaring contradiction of its claims to being a *progressively developing* theology, whilst every distinctive dogma of that theology proves it to be neither a development nor progressive, but plainly the opposite of both.

Such evasions, not otherwise to designate them, are frivolous, and wholly unsuited to the serious nature of the matter under discussion, and the more serious issues involved in the Lancaster theory.

But leaving these introductory attempts a till-timed pleasantry, we proceed to expose the evasions of the main part of the reply.

Following the order of statement adopted in the previous article, and pursued by the reply, we notice:

1. The attempted answer to the charge, that Lancaster theology is *retrogressive* (that is, goes backward) rather than progressive, and, therefore, not in any proper sense a development.

To this charge Lancaster now replies that, its theology has, indeed, in some sense *gone backwards* some steps (for instance, to the third or fourth century), but only *to get good footing for a surer leap forward*. And then it is quietly assumed, that such a leap or stride forward *has been made*!

But here is just the point to be proven. The December article denies that Lancaster theology shows any such advance as it claims in regard to any of its peculiar tenets, unless (as was intimated) a single exception be made in regard to the pantheizing element it has incorporated into its scheme. Lancaster sacerdotalism, sacramentalism, and ecclesiasticism, *are in no material, essential respect* in advance of Cyprianism. It has gone back with the hope, or intention, perhaps, of finding some *high and dry* point from which to leap, not only over the twelve centuries, from Cyprian to the Reformation, but also over the three which have passed since the Reformation. But instead of finding such a point, it has sunk in the sands of Africa, and is hopelessly sticking fast there.

These facts, however, the Lancaster respondent wholly evades. The argument required him to show that the tenets of his theology on the topics named, and others kindred to them, are really a development of those older Cyprian tenets. Was he unable to do this? We believe he was. We feel persuaded that it cannot be done. For, as already said, Lancaster theology is, in reference to the opinions named, substantially a reproduction in the nineteenth century, English, of what Cyprian wrote in the fourth century, Latin, (and that English, by the way, no more lucid than his Latin.)

Why does our Lancaster friend evade the point? "Is it honest," we may fairly ask him, as he asked us, some weeks ago?\*

2. Turning to the next topic, the reply betrays the same inability to discern the point, or the same lack of candor in recognizing it.

All evangelical theology for three centuries has, with scarcely an exception, maintained that the vicarious death of Jesus Christ is the ground and foundation of redemption. What Lancaster teaches to the contrary, has been abundantly shown, and is not denied. And what Lancaster needs to demonstrate, that *its dogma concerning redemption by the organic conjunction of the Godhead with humanity in the incarnation*, is a legitimate development of the doctrine of the Reformed church. But this the respondent utterly

\*It seems almost too trivial to notice what the Lancaster writer says about the application of the term "*new*," to their theology, as though it were inconsistent to call it *new*, and yet charge it with being a rehash of something *old*. It is *new* for the Reformed church. He knows that was what it meant when the term is applied to his theology, as has often been stated.



evades. Instead of doing this, he seems to hide himself behind other things not at all to the point. Could he not make out his case? We must think so, unless he meets it more manfully and squarely.

Remember, the issue between Lancaster and the Reformed church, is NOT that there was "*a necessity for the incarnation in order that a union might be effected between the divine and human in the person of Christ.*" This is one of those speciously ambiguous ways of putting things into which the writer of the sentence quoted has unhappily fallen, perhaps without being aware of it. Like many other modes of statement to which his school, when pressed, takes refuge, it may mean one thing or it may mean another. And by this ambiguity (*zweidentigkeit*) some are deluded, as we ourselves were until the snare was discovered.

Remember, again, the issue is NOT that, as in order to man's salvation he must be reconciled to God, or restored to union with God, "*this union can be secured only through the (antecedent) union of God with man in Jesus Christ.*" This, also, is language which any evangelical theologian may use, and which many do use, in a Gospel sense. For a member of the Lancaster Faculty to employ such language in setting forth the peculiar tenet of his school on this point, is therefore evasive and deceptive. He may himself have been deceived by his own words. No reflection is intended in saying this. But it is the most charitable of the only two possible explanations of his using such terms in the case. If *they* expressed all his school meant, there would be no development at all, taking the language in its usual sense. But our friend knows as well as we do, at least, that Lancaster employs the term *union*, and the phrase "union of the two natures," in a sense wholly different from that commonly attached to them by Protestant theology. *Here it is the evasion comes in*, an evasion in argument to which, as he is well aware, logic applies no very complimentary epithet.

No. The point at issue here is this, if it must be repeated: Lancaster has taught and teaches, that man's redemption is *effected organically by an organic conjunction of the Godhead (the Logos) with humanity*, and not by the vicarious sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. *This now, we affirm, is not a development of the old evangelical doctrine on the subject, but a perversion or a subversion of it.*

And *this* is the point which the Lancaster Faculty needs to meet. Does it now understand?

Whether it can find some authority for its peculiar theory in the case, in Schleiermacher, and in other German theology, is not the question now. That point may be settled another time. Let it stick to the precise matter in hand for the present. It claims to be a "historical development" theology. The writer of "Not to the Point" affirms, and we fully endorse the affirmation, that the Lancaster theory of redemption by the incarnation, is not a legitimate development, but a contradiction of the old evangelical faith on this doctrine. *Let there be no evading the point.*

3. When the Lancaster respondent comes to the next item in the charge brought against his school, viz: That the so-called Lancaster *developments*, instead of going forward to something really in advance of other theologies, have simply fallen back into Romish or ultra-Lutheran views—he really gives up the point, whilst seeming to repel it. Like the Parthian, he runs away shouting, and shooting back his arrows.

True, something is said about the desirableness of having the two branches of the reformation, Lutheranism and the Reform, brought into harmony on some higher ground and faith; all very pleasant reading.

But, first, the delightful subject of church union for which Lancaster is always ready to plead so eloquently until some actual, practical measures, for effecting it upon an evangelical basis is proposed, is not by any means necessarily involved in the present discussion. To introduce it here, therefore, is only calculated to divert or confuse the mind and argument in regard to the matter in hand, which is the pretension, of Lancaster theology to being a genuine historical development. This should not be evaded. Let us stick vigorously to it until it is settled.

And, second, proposals and schemes for some real union between the Reformed and Lutheran churches, are more than three hundred years old. Hence, Lancaster cannot claim the revival of any such union movement as a development of its theology.

And, third, by the Lancaster theology plan, the method of effecting the union is a surrendering, as we affirm, of Reformed principles to ultra-Lutheranism. That is, as we charge, Lancaster developes Reformed doctrines on certain fundamental points back into ultra-Lutheran doctrines, and thus forfeits its pretensions to



being a true historical development of Reformed theology. *This is the point at issue.* Let there be no evasion of it.

*Ebrard* is a very good man, and a very learned theologian. And it could be devoutly wished that on many doctrines Lancaster had kept clinging more closely to *Ebrard*. But we are not discussing *Ebrard* just now.

*Martensen* was a very good man, and has left behind him a very excellent Lutheran system of theology, which it were well for certain Iowa and Missouri Lutherans to adopt more fully. But we are not discussing *Martensen* just now.

Our present point is, *how can Lancaster Theology make good its pretensions to development when, on the points indicated, it is simply, as Fritschel clearly proved, a falling back into the lap of ultra-Lutheranism.*

All this may seem to some like pressing our Lancaster friends somewhat closely against the wall. Our apology is the need of doing so in view of the serious matters involved, especially for those to whom the old faith of evangelical Reformed theology is dear.

Lancaster may not be conscious of the subversive character of its peculiar theology. It may really be deluding itself with the imagination that its theology *is* really in essential harmony with the principles of our established faith, and that no betrayal of that faith is involved in its tenets and teachings. But if Lancaster is thus deceiving itself, there is no reason why others should be in like manner deluded. At any rate, it is just and proper to hold it to a fair and unequivocal proof of its claims. And this must be demanded without evasions.

But one word more. What is said in the article "Not to the Point," about *doctrines being fixed*, is *misquoted* by our friend. It is *not* said that there "is no development in doctrines," as to the mode of "apprehending and stating" them. The opposite of this is freely admitted. It is, however, affirmed, that the *doctrine itself*, which is the soul, the substance of the statement as its body, is fixed. This we fully endorse, and we go further and say, that *any essential change of the doctrine, whilst the statement of it, its outward body, so to speak, is mainly retained, is an imposture and a fraud.* Both Arius and Pelagius attempted to palm off their errors upon the church by such a fraud, but they were detected and condemned.

## THE POPE ON PROTESTANTISM IN ROME.

THE Pope may be a prisoner in the Vatican, but the power to curse is still left him, and he uses that power freely. "Bless, and curse not," is a sentence of the Bible to which the Vicar of Christ gives but little heed. The latest objects of his wrath, are the evangelical Protestants who are laboring among the people of the city of Rome. Under the authority of, and in the name of the Pope, an invitation has been issued to the faithful to attend the commemoration of St. Peter's liberation from prison, "*in order to appease the wrath of God, excited by the progress of Protestantism in Rome.*"

The text of this precious document should be read by every American who is in doubt of the real spirit of the Roman Catholic church. It calls the missionaries "mercenary apostates," who have come to Rome "with the intention of overthrowing Catholicism in its very seat. *Profiting by that liberty, which to the shame and detriment of the Catholic religion, is granted to all sects, they first began secretly to spread falsified Bibles, and then openly to invite principally young people and idiots to public conferences.*" "What," the invitation adds, "but a hypocritical *larva* is that specious name of Evangelical which Protestants give to themselves and their conventicles? And what but a lying appearance is that faith which they so much exalt, and pretend is alone sufficient to justify men and lead them to salvation?"

The Pope says very plainly, that if he could, he would clear the Protestant missionaries out of the city. "It is a cause of supreme bitterness to the heart of the Holy Father, not to be able otherwise to impose a limit to so much evil, as he certainly would do, *if he could* make use of other means to bridle the license of the impious perverters of true doctrine." If Pius had his will, would not the Inquisition be active this very day in Rome?

And this man calls himself a God. This mouth so full of cursing, dares to speak of the Prince of Peace? And his priestly followers, under the protection of liberty here, are conspiring for liberty's overthrow. What they would do in Rome, if they could, their principles would oblige them to do in New York. Under Ultramontane direction, the Roman Catholic church is a perpetual conspiracy against the liberties of mankind. It denies all liberty but its own; when it can, it crushes, when it cannot crush, it curses. Thank God, its curses are harmless.—*Methodist.*



## Ursinus College Repertory.

### THE SCHAFF LITERARY SOCIETY.

As previously announced in the *Monthly*, the Schaff Literary Society held its second anniversary in Ursinus Chapel, December 18th, 1873.

A large and attentive audience graced the occasion. The chapel was handsomely decorated. The music, although not that called for by the published notices, was, nevertheless, excellent.

The opening prayer was announced by Rev. George Wolff, of Myerstown, Pa.

Anniversaries are always the same, except so far as individualities of speakers differ, and are made to differ by modes of training. The same changes of good or bad have been rung through the ages. The "best speech" and the "finest poem" have been delivered a thousand times over. Yet it can not be otherwise. The new is but the old wrought in a fresh mold. What this mold is, depends largely upon training. Training affects the individual. The individual leaves only the impress of his individuality on the object matter of thought.

Armed with these views, we were gratified while listening to the addresses of the young gentlemen representing at this time the Schaff Literary Society. No uncertain sound came from them. There was no standing with the back towards the sun and peering, as it were, into a dark and gloomy past. All around beamed a light, emanating from a greater light within, which shed a bright and peaceful calm upon the hearer. A true Christian philosophy ran through, molded and fashioned, every sentiment uttered from the young, boyish salutorian, down to the manly and dignified Schaff-Orator.

Besides, there was a crystal flow of thought, and transparency and terseness in sentences, that made the task of understanding quite agreeable. The pronunciation was English, and the accent

up to standard. The language used showed a study of words and judgment in shades of meaning. All in all, we think this Anniversary has added another bright leaf to the fair and goodly wreath of Ursinus College.

R.

---

#### THE SPIRIT OF DISCOVERY.

MAN, though fashioned by the hands of His maker, and endowed with an immortal mind, is, nevertheless, a creature of limited knowledge. The secrets of his own being, and the grand and glorious manifestations of the invisible power, as displayed in the heavens and on the earth, have ever filled him with awe and veneration. But there is a spirit in man—a spirit which impels him, from the very nature of his being, to explore the unknown, and to search out the mysteries of the organic and inorganic world until all obscurity and confusion vanish, and he possesses a clear, distinct, and adequate conception of the object of his search. This spirit is an outgrowth from the peculiarity of man's capacity for knowledge. God, who is unlimited in all His attributes, created man with powers subordinate to His own, but placed within him a desire which, by prompting him to investigate the wonders of Himself, and the sublime mysteries of nature around him, expands and strengthens the mental powers and fits him for the duties of a high and noble life. Every conscious being is born with capacity to receive ideas and capability to learn. As the spirit to investigate is intimately connected with all knowledge, it follows, therefore, that it is inherent in the entire human race; not in degree, but as some are raised above their fellows by particular talents, and others, in a still higher degree, by genius, so the peculiar abilities of one discoverer differ from those of another in whatever sphere he may prosecute his research. Looking through the vista of ages past, we see man beholding in amazement the glorious sun and the starry heavens, until lost in wonder he pays them the adoration due the Deity. While plowing the deep in his frail bark, ever in sight of land, we behold him gazing upon the immensity of sea beyond, with feelings of mingled awe and admiration; or, turning the eye of his mind inward, and



endeavoring to solve the nature of his being, he discovers the mysteries only to increase as he advances in his investigations. Here are presented fields for discovery so vast, that man can never expect to fathom them—so varied, that a life of toil can be rewarded by but glimpses of their unnumbered beauties. If we turn our attention to the discoveries made in the past, we shall find that man has been actuated in their pursuit by different motives. In the life of the immortal Columbus, we have a spirit of humility and true piety; combined with courage, determination, and an ambition truly noble. Destitute of the means necessary to forward his plans and projects—held in ridicule and contempt by men, and pointed at as insane by the very children—deferred from time to time in his solicitations for aid and assistance, he, nevertheless, for a period of eighteen years, never grew faint under difficulties, but persisted in his enterprise until his indomitable perseverance was crowned with success. Calumny has dared to represent him as impelled by mercenary motives, and a desire selfish and avaricious, but the true hand of history has blotted it from its page. In striving to attain wealth and honor, he sought them only as commensurate to his success. The love of country pervaded his spirit, whilst a strong faith in his religion made him desirous of spreading it throughout the habitable world; so that, in imagination, he conceived himself as sent forth on his mission by God Himself, and guarded and controlled by Him in a supernatural manner. In the discoveries made in those ice-bound regions which surround the north and the south poles, there is exhibited a spirit of courage and fortitude never surpassed and seldom equaled. Nations have vied with one another in fitting out vessels under command of heroic men who, from time to time, have endeavored to penetrate these dreary regions. Never have greater hardships been endured, never has the spirit to overcome all obstacles been more manifest in man than the daring and unflinching courage of England's Franklin, Ross, and Parry; and of America's Kane, Hayes and Hall. In the expeditions fitted out to obtain tidings of the noble Sir John Franklin, we have an example of a spirit exhibiting not only courage, but a sympathy Christian, and an attachment strong and fervent. Our own country now mourns the sad fate of Captain Hall, who, in the cause of science, and in the endeavor to solve the mysteries of Franklin's death, believed himself to be *called* to enter upon this important work. His mission was not

fruitless. But although he succeeded in discovering the fate of Franklin, and reached a point of latitude far in the unknown north, he himself was seized upon by death, and his body now reposes in its icy tomb. In him our country has lost one of her bravest sons, one whom history shall ever recognize among the most daring navigators on the globe. When we turn our eyes from earth to the heavens, and gaze upon the mighty skies, we realize that in the entire domain of science there is nothing to excite in the spirit of man greater grandeur and sublimity. Who does not admire the spirit of Copernicus, that "Astronomical Columbus," who kept secret his theory of the planetary motions until he had tested it for a period of twenty-three years? Who can understand the strength of will which checked his burning desire to proclaim his grand discoveries to the world? Galileo, living in an age of superstition, and surrounded and opposed by bitter enemies, was not shaken in confidence. Equipped with his rude telescope, he pursued his brilliant discoveries with unabated enthusiasm and diligence. Kepler, the discoverer of the wonderful laws which bear his name, possessed a spirit ardent and restless. Nothing was thought too difficult, and everything undertaken was followed with the most obstinate perseverance. The sublime discoveries of the Herschels gave a new impetus to science; whilst the name of Newton, the Christian philosopher, is enshrined in the hearts of nations. No skepticism marred his philosophy. His reason saw no variance between science and the Bible. Unlike the philosophers of his age, he hesitated to announce any hypothesis before he had proved it. In the sphere of mathematics, the wonderful calculations of Euler and La Place have been of incalculable importance. The splendid geometry of the latter has been the means of effecting the most wonderful discoveries in the science of astronomy.

Michael Faraday, when called upon to decide between wealth and science, chose the latter. He died poor; but his devotion to science, and the beauty of his character, only add new lustre to his grand discoveries. Humboldt has left as a legacy of study and research, his invaluable "Cosmos;" a work which maintains its supremacy without a rival. In our examination of the discoveries made which pertain to the physical and moral nature of man, we find that the learned of every age have ever been at variance in regard to their opinions. Regarding one class, we observe the



theories of those naturalists who contend that every type of existence, both material and spiritual, is developed from pre-existent types. As examples of this class, we have Herbert Spencer, Huxley and Darwin—men who, notwithstanding their apparent honesty and extensive learning, have never succeeded in establishing their peculiar theories. Darwin's "Origin of the Species," a work which for a time received the plaudits of the skeptical scholar, is now held by him in derision. In combating their errors, we find the distinguished names of Owen, Agassiz and Dana. Their spirit of discovery is manifest when Agassiz, so lately lost to science and to the world, and whose mortal remains were to-day carried to the tomb, asserts that "all just and thorough classification is but an interpretation of the thoughts of the Creator." A like disagreement is evident in the works of those whose study is the human soul. Here materialism asserts its sway over some of the most gifted minds God ever created. There its errors are exposed and corrected by men like Porter and Haven—men of faith, as well as of science. In the entire domain of all knowledge, we perceive progression and advancement; but whatever may be the object of man's investigation, the true spirit will be manifest only when in entire subjection to the will of the Infinite Mind. To such a one "every scientific experiment is an act of reverent worship." As he pursues his discoveries, and perceives in every advancement greater and more sublime mysteries, like Kepler he may exclaim, "O God! I think Thy thoughts after Thee!" In the distant wilds of Africa we have witness of such a spirit. Nations have lavished honors upon the man who has risked his life not only to impart new knowledge to science, but who, with Bible in hand, has sought to Christianize the most degraded of savages. You remember the anxiety of the civilized world when his death was announced; and you remember the joy and the gladness which filled every heart when assured by the brave Stanley of his safety. The name of Livingstone is enshrined in the memory of all—a name which throughout coming ages shall be regarded as combining preëminently the motives which originate the true spirit of discovery.

L. G. K.

---

A HOLY life is a voice; it speaks when the tongue is silent, and is either a constant attraction or a perpetual reproof.

## FAMILY RELIGION.

THIS was the subject of a very important and well-written paper by the Rev. J. C. Harrison, D.D., of London, read at the Evangelical Alliance on the evening of October 7th. Starting with the remark of Madame de Stael, that if you ask an Englishman at the very end of the world where he is going, he will be sure to reply "Home," the author observes that the principles and character of Englishmen are formed chiefly at home, and that character is the principal thing. What a man is, is of far more importance than what he possesses. The child needs to have everything presented in the concrete. Right, truth, love, purity, must be seen in actual life, if their nature is to be clearly apprehended. "Where love is warm and disinterested, where joy is constant as the sunshine, where self is forgotten in care for others, where distrust is shut out by mutual confidence, where purity reigns supreme, there you have the condition in which the highest results may be expected; and nowhere are these conditions to be met with so surely and so fully as in a pious home." The principal charm of the sweet idyls of the Old Testament lies in their descriptions of happy family life. In the New Testament the unity of the household is always implied. Dr. Farrar has remarked, however, that the ancient heathen writers, even the ancient poets, but "rarely refer, even in the most cursory manner to their early years; whereas there is scarcely a single modern poet who has not lingered with undisguised feelings of happiness over the memories of his childhood." The words of the late Norman McLeod, that "Romanism is chiefly the religion of the church, Protestantism of the family," are also significant in the same direction. Dr. Harrison continues:

Those remarkable men who, in 1620, resolved to cross the Atlantic and found a new settlement on the shores of America, were men distinguished by family religion no less than for individual faith. . . . For many years after the departure of the Pilgrim Fathers from Europe, those who held to Evangelical principles and resolved to carry them out to the full, had, if we except the period of the Commonwealth, hard times of it in England. Many of them, at length most of them, became Nonconformists, and they had to meet for public worship chiefly by stealth, or under restrictions which kept them in continual fear. Probably



these very checks to public worship led them all the more diligently to cultivate family religion. We have now and then glimpses of family religion in those days, which ate exquisitely beautiful and refreshing, and which account for the depth and intelligence of the piety which we then so often find. Chief among these is the sketch which Matthew Henry has lovingly made of the home of his childhood at Worthenbury and Broad Oak, where rule and order were strictly maintained, but where joy and freedom equally flourished. His father, Philip Henry, was one of those rare spirits who seem always to dwell on high, and whose life does more than the strongest arguments to draw men to Christ. Morning and evening you see his children and servants collected together for family worship, but not till he and his wife have knelt together in secret, for they wished to live as heirs together of the grace of Christ, that their prayers, especially their prayers together, should not be hindered. "Those do well," he was accustomed to say, "that pray morning and evening in their families; those do better that pray and read the Scriptures; but those do best that pray and read and sing psalms; and Christians should covet earnestly the best gifts." This rule he himself observed. Beginning with a short but solemn invocation of the divine presence and grace, he gave out a psalm, which was "sung quick; with a good variety of proper and pleasant tunes," for he used to say "the voice of rejoicing and salvation should be in the tabernacles of the righteous." He next read a portion of Scripture, taking the Bible in order. In "prayers," he would remark, "we speak to God; by the Word He speaks to us; and is there any reason that we should speak all? In the tabernacle the priests were everyday to burn incense and to light the lamps—the former figuring the duty of prayer, the latter the duty of reading the Word." What he read in his family he always expounded, and here he had a peculiar excellence. "His observations," his son tells us, "were many times very pretty and surprising, and such as we shall not ordinarily meet with." After his exposition he would ask his children for some account of what he had said, and would try to impress it on their hearts. He encouraged them also to write down afterward what they could remember. Then he knelt down and offered prayer, and "took care that his family should address themselves to the duty with the outward expressions of reverence and composedness. He usually fetched his

matter and expressions in prayer from the chapter that was read, and the psalm that was sung, which was often very affecting, and helped much to stir up and excite praying graces." "Immediately after the prayer was ended, his children together with bended knee asked blessing of him and their mother; that is, desired of them to pray God to bless them, which blessing was given with great solemnity and affection; and if any one of them were absent, they were remembered—the Lord bless you and your brother; or, you and your sister that is absent." And lest any one should suppose from this description that the service must have been very protracted, likely to disgust rather than attract the members of the household, his biographer adds, "He managed his daily family worship so as to make it a pleasure, and not a task to his children and servants, for he was seldom long, and never tedious in the services. The variety of the duties made it the more pleasant, so that none who joined him had ever reason to say 'behold what a weariness is it.' Such an excellent faculty he had for rendering religion the most sweet and amiable employment in the world; and so careful was he, like Jacob, to drive as the children should go. If some good people that mean well would do likewise, it might prevent many of the prejudices which young persons are apt to conceive against religion, when the services of it are made a toil and a terror to them." Then he endeavored to make the Lord's Day a day of special joy. His common salutation to his family and friends on the morning of that day was, "The Lord is risen, He is risen indeed," and that was the keynote to which all the employments of the day were set. The voice of praise was more frequently heard, subjects of an exhilarating triumphant character occupied the attention, a tone of thankfulness and gladness was maintained.

But Mr. Henry did not depend for the formation of his children's character upon exercises directly religious. He sought by mildness and gentleness, combined with firmness, to win their respect and affection, and thereby draw them into the path which he pursued, for he was most careful not to enjoin on them what he did not exemplify himself. He allowed them great freedom with him, encouraging them to ask questions on any subject which interested them, and taking great pains to give them adequate and satisfactory answers. He was very anxious to make them prefer character to persuasions or rank, guarded them against "minding



high things," but urged them to hunger and thirst after righteousness. He encouraged them by some decided step to commit themselves to the service of God, as by adopting a form of covenant or taking the Lord's Supper. Thus by prayer, by praise, by systematic instruction in the Scriptures, by free conversation, by personal example and influence, he sought to make the family religion a joyous reality in his household, and in this he was so successful that all his children became exemplary for their piety.

Now, I do not mean to say that all parents have the knowledge or skill to train their family as Philip Henry did his, nor do I mean that it is desirable that all should adopt his exact method, but I do maintain that all ought in great measure to employ the same deliberate thought, that so the education of their children may not be a thing of chance, but a thing of wisely-ordered purpose. I think this may be safely affirmed, that the religious life of the family has always been of the same specific order as the general religious life of the age; and it is so in the present day. Now the tendency of the present times is to freedom. This tendency is especially manifest among the easier, wealthier classes of the community, whose consequent habits are unfavorable to the cultivation of family religion. They keep before them no ideal of home which they carefully endeavor to realize, but allow accident very much to determine what it shall be. Their spirit naturally spreads through the whole family, who at last prefer a feverish, sensational life, to a life of deep, quiet enjoyment. Religion in such a household may not be formally renounced, but evidently it can do little to mold the character or elevate the life.

I say that this is the tendency of things, but I would carefully add that, as a matter of fact, the exceptions are both numerous and delightful. Many of the finest examples of family religion are still to be found in this rank. In the less easy and wealthy classes, where steady, diligent work demands a certain sturdiness and robustness, and tends to check both speculation and luxury, much of the old, quiet, domestic religion still prevails. Family prayer is maintained, the children are regularly instructed in the Word of God, home influence and example exert a salutary power. Even here, I fancy, there is less of system than there used to be, and more of freedom, and this is by no means altogether a disadvantage.—*N. Y. Evangelist.*

## THE MISSION OF THE GERMAN RACES.

IF two fundamental races have filled ancient history and the ancient world, two fundamental races fill the modern world and modern history—that is to say, the Latin and German races. The latter has always borne with it the idea of individuality, and has opposed this undying individuality, caught from the very bosom of nature, to the absorbing forces, to the institution—means of civilization in certain historical periods, but always repressive—of the Helleno-Latin race, more artistic, more humane, if you please, than the German races, but less apt to preserve its entire liberty, and to hear in daily life the call of its own conscience.

It is an irrevocable law of history that the German races should destroy the great unities reared by the Helleno-Latin races—those great unities beneath whose weight human personality disappears, and with it the law of liberty in life. The famous writers of antiquity announced, with the prophetic power of their genius, the destiny confided to the Germanic races at the close of those states of society. When Lucian described in imperishable verses the ruin of Liberty at Pharsalia, he did not see that it became extinguished. He saw it pass the Rhine, take refuge with the primitive and ancient tribes known as Germans. Tacitus, the conscience, the remorse of the ancient society—Tacitus, who heated his steel red hot in the fire of the love of liberty, to plunge it like a dagger into the hearts of tyrants—opposes to the work of Cæsarism the work of nature; to the despotic empire the federation of tribes; to the magistracy imposed by Pretorian slaves the magistracy elected by freemen; to the corrupted court of the emperors the loving family, the respect for women, the purity of morals, acquired in the inspirations of conscience and the exercise of liberty.

Cæsar, on whose brow appeared to have been condensed all the genius of Rome, trembled before this immense mystery, which was called the German world, and wished to inclose it in his empire. And in these distant forests and plains, in the sleep of primitive life, in their blind intercourse with nature, the Germans felt their wrath against the eternal city rise like a hot wind. "I do not go of my own will to Rome," exclaimed Alaric in his raids; "I feel that something superior to me pushes me on, drags me forward, without giving me rest, and forces me imperiously to sack Rome."



Genseric unfurled the sails of his ship to the wind, not knowing where he was going. The pilot asked him, "Lord, where are we going?" "To seek these people against whom the wrath of God is aroused;" and they went to Rome. What was it which these barbarians hated most in Rome? It was the principle hostile to their principle, the ideal contrary to theirs. They hated the omnipotent power, the absorbing authority, the Cæsarism which denied the very root of life, our personality. And from that time, whenever the Latin world has arrived, by the impulse of its character, by the work of its federation, at one of those political or social states which reproduce the Roman empire, the Germanic race has always come to reestablish the principle of individuality. Thus, as the hordes of Alaric and Genseric, born in the forest, educated in the shock of battle, without any home but their war-car, without any patrimony but their arms, rushed to devastate Rome because it was the centre of imperial and Cæsarist unity, the descendants of these hordes fulfill in the middle ages, in the Renaissance, and in modern times, the same ministry they accomplished at the end of ancient history. If the French people, apostatizing from Germanic principle, reestablish the empire under Charlemagne, other tribes, other European families of the same origin, scourged by the sword of the Normans, found modern individualism in the feudal chaos. When the Popes seized the control of conscience, and organized by their theocracy a strong government and universal authority proceeding from Rome, the German empire, and its most illustrious representative, the House of Suabia, contested this religious unity with political and civil opposition, and prevented in the west a disastrous copy of the Oriental tyranny of Byzantium, founded by a coalition of the patriarch and the emperor. In the sixteenth century the Emperor Charles V., on one side, with his immense domains, and the artistic Popes on the other, with their immense *prestige*, saved the church from schism, dissolved the councils which threatened the power of the church, reduced Ghent to submission, decapitated municipal freedom in Villalar and the brotherhoods in Valentia, who threatened the power of the empire. When two powers of such force on earth, as the power of Charles V., who found a new world in the seas, and the power of Leo X., who found an ancient world among the ruins, threatened to restore Cæsarism, there arose to hinder it, to deprive the pontificate of its *prestige* and the

empire of its peace, the obscure monk Luther who, collecting all the anger of his race, from the blasphemies of the drunken peasant to the prayer of angels in ecstasy, sacked the Rome of religion with the same wrath with which Alaric and Genseric had sacked, a thousand years before, the Rome of the Cæsars. The power of Philip II. suffocated Protestantism; but a German by race, a Hollander by birth, named Orange, threw down the colossus which covered Europe with its shadow. If the policy of Louis XIV. in the following century, engendered another gigantic Catholic reaction, as well in conscience as in courts; another Orange, also a German by race, and a Hollander by birth, raised the Protestant individualized religion to the throne in England. If the kings in the middle of the eighteenth century established their absolute authority, despoiling even the church of its attributes, the Germanic races, or their Saxon families, shook these absolute powers with the proclamation of the republic, and the advent of democracy in America. If, in the triumph of revolutionary principles in 1793, and their new triumph in 1848, the Cæsarist reaction, initiated first by the Cæsar of our time, and by his descendant, the new Augustus, founded an imperial authority, the Germans, Wellington and Blücher at Waterloo, and Von Moltke and Bismarck at Sedan, destroyed these empires, and elevated anew the idea of human individuality, which is like the bone and marrow of all our liberties.—*Emilio Castelar, in Harper's Magazine for July.*

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

As our Christmas vacation occurs in mid-winter, it gives the College and its grounds a more deserted and desolate appearance than either of the other vacations. This year the heavy, sombre weather has added to the general effect. There are, however, several alleviating influences. First of all, and chiefly, the hallowed memories of the festival season, with the social Christian pleasures it brings with it in the "church, in the house," as well as in the general congregation, did much to relieve the case. There could hardly be said, indeed, to have been a Christmas at the College, for it was nearly empty. But there were Christmases all around, and most especially in the Trappe Reformed church, which those



connected with the institution generally attend. The evening of the happy day was set apart for a festival of the Sunday-school of the church, and was observed with appropriate services. Dressed in holiday attire, the dinginess of the old edifice disappeared for the time. The house was filled with children, teachers, parents, and many interested friends. All were delighted with the excellence of the singing, for which the school and congregation are largely indebted to the musical skill and taste, and the untiring energy of the Superintendent of the school, H. W. Kratz, esq. Addresses were delivered by Prof. Weinberger, and by the pastor of the congregation. Then followed, to the manifest joy of the children, the distribution of "the boxes" with their delectable contents. Altogether, the occasion was one of the purest pleasure, and helped its full share to make a part of the vacation pass pleasantly.

To this was added the thought, that the desertion of the College halls at this time contributed to the pleasure of the several homes of the students and others who have temporarily left us, as well as to their own greater enjoyment of the season in those homes.

Finally, the days of rest from College work, afforded some leisure for looking back with gratitude over what, under the favor of the Lord, the Institution has accomplished, and the success which has marked the past Term, as well as forward with hope to the cheering prospects of the future. No Institution of our church has greater reason, in every view, for humble rejoicing over what has been thus far achieved, than Ursinus College. And the many friends who feel a warm and intelligent interest in the prosperity of the Institution may well be allowed to indulge and express their thankful gladness at its prosperity.

The next Term of the School will open on Monday, January 5, 1874. Applications already made indicate that their will again be a considerable accession.

Our friends will please remember that the *Academic Department* of the College offers the best advantages of an English, German, and Classical Boarding and Day School. Students and pupils over twelve years of age, of all grades, are received. The prices of Tuition and Boarding, &c., are moderate, and the accommodations all that could be desired. For further particulars, those wishing information can apply as directed in the advertisement on the last page of the Monthly.

*It will be gratifying* to our absent friends to learn that during the vacation, two gentlemen, aged respectively 45 and 30 years, were received and passed through a very brief but very pleasant *course of two hours*, when they were dismissed with an oral diploma, setting forth that they had acquitted themselves most creditably, and fully entitled to all the honors and immunities due to such a course.

Perhaps as this was an *extra-ordinary* case, the above statement needs some elucidation. This we most cheerfully give. The gentlemen were a delegation from St. Peter's Reformed church, connected with the Trappe charge! They entered the College precincts, in other words the President's house, on "the night before Christmas," bringing with them ample recommendations in the form of a weighty member of the royal family of the Turkeys, of great reputation at this season, and a wagon load of other equally valuable articles, "too numerous to mention." Coming with such certificates, there could be no hesitation in admitting them; and as they acquitted themselves admirably in their subsequent duties, it took but a short time to "put them through." This was the more readily effected, as the kind friends of St. Peter's had "paved the way" for a pleasant passage through this department of the College course, by previous gift of a first class Buffalo robe and a splendid pair of otter-fur gloves. For all which they have our most hearty thanks.

*A few days* of the vacation have been pleasantly spent in brief visits to several brethren, all of whom we rejoiced to find vigorously successfully prosecuting their important work. From all were received, also, warm and substantial assurances of unabated interest in our Institutions, and in the cause they represent.

---

## EDITORS' DESK.

*"Unser Anfang sey im Namen des Herrn der Himmel und Erde gemacht hat. Amen!*

With these words which awaken sacred memories associated with the days of our earliest youth, and which at the same time enter in their deepest sense into all our present convictions, would we greet our friends at the beginning of



a new year. "The name of the Lord is a strong tower, the righteous fleeeth into it and is safe." To begin any work in His name, is to commence with true faith in the Lord, with hearty reliance upon His power, truth and grace in Jesus Christ, and with a sincere purpose to devote all our time, our strength, and our labors to His service, and in obedience to His will. Doing this will inspire unwavering confidence and encouragement in the prosecution of our work, and secure through the divine favor, all needful succor, wisdom and might. Any work truly identified with the glory of the name of the Lord, has God's signature of approval and unfailing pledge of a blessed issue.

Let all make sure, therefore, of beginning the year in the spirit of votive supplication, that starting with the Lord, and continuing in firm adherence to Him, His truth, His cause, and the interests of the cause of His dear Son, "the beginning and the end, our life, and our life's work," may ever declare, "Not unto us, oh Lord, not unto us, but to Thy name be all the glory."

*As the Monthly was called out* by the necessity which demanded some special publication in maintenance and defence of the established principles and faith of our church against the perverting efforts and tendencies of the high-church sacerdotal party, the perseverance of that party in its schemes and teachings, renders a continuance of the *Monthly* necessary. That it is mainly controversial in its character, is not our fault, any more than it was Paul's fault that he had to fight at Ephesus, or to contend at Philippi. Of course, those who sought to pervert the Gospel, as it is said some did in Galatia, endeavored to excite hostility against the apostle who withstood and largely frustrated their efforts by denouncing him as a contentious fellow, as a disturber of the peace. But the accusation was both calumnious and deceptive. Wherefore, the apostle toiled on, "fighting the good fight of faith," as long as an enemy to the Gospel was on the field, and a victory for the Gospel was to be won.

The advocates of the anti-Reformed errors, inculcated and vindicated at Lancaster, show no signs of giving up the unhappy controversy they have waged against Reformed doctrines. They are, evidently, hard pressed. An incautious disciple has allowed a word to "emanate" from his pen which let out more than it was desired quite so plainly to reveal. They have, even themselves, gotten deeper into the mire by trying to help their friend and his unhappy argument in favor of a pantheistic view of regeneration by baptism, out. They find themselves closely pressed against the wall by the exposure of the inward contradictions and inconsistencies of their progressive "development" theory. But still they seem determined to cling to their absurd and mischievous fancies. Having set out years ago with a full purpose to make a reputation for their school, and to secure renown for themselves, by devising and promulgating an *original* and most profoundly marked philosophy and theology, they seem bent on securing their aim, even though the profundity should be that of a quagmire, and their remarkable originality should amount to little more than putting Hegel's hat on Cyprian's head.

This being the case, necessity is laid upon us to continue the *Monthly* mainly as heretofore. It will keep on in a *positive* way, by holding forth in its pages

the Gospel superiority and excellence of the old apostolic faith of the church, as laid down in her doctrinal standards, taken in the plain sense in which they have always been received. And, *negatively*, it will continue to watch, expose, and withstand the anti-Reformed "developments" and tendencies of those who, under the guise and cover of a "progressive theology," are, consciously or unconsciously, not taking two steps backwards that they may leap three forward, but rather occasionally seem to take one step forward, that they may leap six or sixteen backwards.

---

*Peace, peace! O let us have peace!* This is now the plausible cry which rolls piteously over the mountains and across our valleys. Who are raising the cry? Those who have been boldly and daringly toiling to introduce radical innovations in faith and practice. And to whom is their cry mainly directed? To those who have disturbed our peace by their doctrinal speculations and innovations? No, but to us who are struggling to maintain the old, tried faith. We shall keep quiet, quit speaking, writing, making such a tremendous noise about those Lancaster doctrines, getting the whole church aroused on the subject! Yes, yes; we understand it. Lancaster and its adjuncts are to be allowed quietly to work and worm on, without being opposed or disturbed, lest the noise of opposition should break somebody's peace! Does the church want peace on such terms?

---

"Our church paper's" editor need not fear that we shall try to draw him into controversy. All our concern is, that his paper, within its own sphere, shall sail under true colors. Let there be no feigned neutrality, if the mind and heart are not neutral, and if the hand is to be ready, with every opportunity, to strike at those who are conscientiously constrained to resist the dogmas and schemes of his favorite school. The issues at stake are vital. We are not contending about mere words and trifles. The controversy involves essential principles. Those principles may not be sacrificed, even to peace. Better hold fast to the faith, fighting, than accept error as the condition of quietness and repose. Truth is of vastly more account than a thousand subscribers secured by speciously pleading for peace.

As to the sermon in which the Bible was said to be no better than the Koran, without the living minister, possibly the editor may find it among his old papers. It was on the text: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." We do not affirm that the sentiment referred to was WRITTEN in the sermon. It may have been freely introduced; but it was spoken or read as though it was a part of the written sermon.

---

*The Evangelical Alliance* has at length received some attention from the Rev. Faculty of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster. *Suaviter in modo!* But how manifest; that amidst their musings the fire burned! By the way, a strange phenomenon might be discovered in the article referred to. It was what might be called *interlinear*, only the line between was written with invisible ink, until some alkali was applied to it.



But, without a figure, it was a very remarkable criticism of the Alliance. The words were as smooth and gentle as any one might wish. But how bitter the spirit. The Alliance would have been all right had only the ultra-Lutherans and their nearest of kin, the Lancaster Mercersburg-Reformed, only been allowed a dominant influence in its deliberations. Those many Presbyterians, however, made it all wrong. What a pity that the Theological Faculty at Lancaster couldn't have a universe all to themselves! Of course they could fill it.

Several matters claiming attention, and noted on our list, must be postponed to the next number. At the suggestion of some friends, we have concluded to republish in several succeeding numbers a tract, now out of print, and which, nevertheless, is important in the history of our church's life-struggle against the ritualistic innovations.

*Special Care—Do you take the Reformed Church Monthly?* It is a monthly periodical of 56 pages, making a volume of 672 pages a year, which can be easily preserved and bound at the end of the year.

*Its great object* is to set forth, maintain and defend the long settled faith and practice of the Reformed church, the principles and doctrines of the church, and to do this in opposition to all efforts made to change both, and to introduce high-church, sacerdotal, ritualistic and Romanizing errors.

*In its matter and style*, it may be called a practical, popular Review, calculated to instruct the readers upon subjects of vital importance, to strengthen them in the faith, and to warn and fortify them against deceitful, misleading errors.

*Every member of the Reformed church* should take it. It supplies them with substantial and profitable articles, such as are not usually published in a weekly paper.

*It costs* but \$2 a year, and for that sum gives more original reading matter than any other religious monthly we know of.

*Try it* for one year, and, like nearly all others who have done so, and love the old faith more than attempted innovations, you will hardly give it up.

Apply to the publisher and principal editor,

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,

(Collegeville P. O.,) Freeland, Montg. co., Pa.

## BOOK NOTICES.

*We are glad to be permitted to announce*, that in about two weeks Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, will publish a volume prepared by our venerable and esteemed Brother, Rev. B. S. Schneck, D.D., entitled, "*Mercersburg Theology Inconsistent with Protestant and Reformed Doctrine.*"

The work is designed to be a *practical* exposure of the theology taught by the so-called Mercersburg (now Lancaster) school, especially as at variance in most material respects with Protestant Reformed standards.

No minister in the Reformed church, unless it might possibly be the Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D., himself, is in all respects, we think, so well qualified for the task thus undertaken, as Dr. Schneck. Without having seen the book, we are not, of course, prepared blindly to endorse all its views, or modes of expressing them. But knowing what we do of the venerable author, we feel persuaded that what he has written will be entitled to the earnest consideration of the entire church.

Some of our younger ministerial brethren and members may need to be told that the church is indebted largely to Dr. Schneck for the establishment of the *Messenger*, and to his editorial ability and faithfulness in that capacity to the church, for the best and purest years of the *Messenger's* career. It was he who, through the columns of that paper, sounded the first public alarm (in 1852, if we do not err), in view of certain articles issuing from Mercersburg. Whilst others let themselves be hoodwinked for the time, he saw the danger, and gave warning of it. For this he was most violently and impudently assailed at a Synod in Lancaster about that time; at least so we were informed by some who were present at that Synod. For many years Dr. S. occupied the post of chief editor of the *Messenger*, and always acceptably—to the church.

But whilst some of our younger brethren may need to be told these things, few men are so well known among the older and middle-aged members of the church as the author of the work about to appear. And we are confident that thousands will be glad to get the book.

Dr. Schneck's age, experience, thorough, hearty knowledge of our principles and doctrines; his long fidelity to the faith and in the service of the church—all fit him in an eminent degree for the performance of the task. He is no alien, but a son of the church vindicating the truth, integrity and faith of his mother.

Lancaster cannot asperse *him* with being animated by disappointed ambition; and those six Reading pastors will not dare to assail him with their nameless stiletto.

Approaching the end of his life, and yet with a mind as clear as his heart is warm, he comes out as under the irresistible impulse of a divine conviction of duty, and most opportunely offers the service of his earnest and faithful testimony against the subversive machinations of Lancaster, and in support of the loved faith of his church.

The book cannot be otherwise than welcomed by all who are sincere and honest in their professions of attachment to our Reformed Evangelical faith.

Even Lancaster and Mercersburg will be ashamed to denounce our venerable Brother's offering; and, if they really do love the Reformed faith more than their own fancies, they must even commend it, and urge their friends to favor its circulation. Orders for the book may be addressed to Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia; to Rev. Dr. Schneck, Chambersburg, or to us.

A fuller notice in February.



## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

OUR OWN CHURCH—*Changes in the Ministry.*—Rev. J. Heckman (of the Presbyterian church) was received, November 11, by Miami Classis, and installed pastor of Salem congregation, Cincinnati (German). His address will be according.

Rev. J. H. Beck to Sabetha, Nemaha county, Kan.

Rev. M. Triebner, late of Switzerland, has been installed pastor of the First Reformed church, Washington, D. C.

Rev. — Moritz, also recently from Switzerland, was installed pastor of Zwingli Reformed church, Harrisburg.

Rev. H. Daniel to Hamilton charge, Monroe county.

Rev. H. C. Heyser to Ebenezer, N. Y.

Rev. S. S. Miller to Boonsboro', Md.

Rev. G. W. Mulder, D. P., to St. James (German), Pittsburg.

Rev. F. Walk was licensed and ordained by Philadelphia Classis, as missionary in and around Swedesboro', N. J.

Rev. H. W. Hoffmeier, South Bend, Armstrong county, Pa.

Rev. Chas. Knepper, of Allegheny Classis, dismissed to the Presbyterian church.

Rev. W. C. Hendrickson, of Heidelberg Reformed church, Philadelphia, to No. 1310 North Nineteenth street.

Rev. L. Richter, received from the Presbyterian church, to Fostoria, Seneca county, O.

GROWTH OF THE CHURCHES.—The Rev. R. S. Appel reports the following additions to congregations in his charge: *St. Peter's*, Berks county, by confirmation, 14; *Epler's*, near Leesport, Berks county, by confirmation, 34.

Rev. M. L. Fritsch having charge of a number of congregations in the vicinity of Reading, lying southeast and southwest of that city, has had his labors rewarded by very encouraging additions to his churches during the past month.

Wooster, O., Rev. A. F. Zartman, by confirmation, 16; by certificate, 5. New Lisbon, O., Rev. G. M. Albright, by confirmation, 9. Millersville, Pa., Rev. A. B. Shenkle, by confirmation, 16. Brother S. reports a highly encouraging condition of the good work in his charge. At the Millersville communion he was assisted by our highly esteemed Brother, G. W. Glessner, whose advancing years seem in no way to diminish the vigor or energy of his earnest and faithful preaching.

Shamokin, Rev. D. W. Kelly, 7.

Mt. Pleasant, Westmoreland county, Pa., Rev. D. B. Lady, 6 by confirmation, 5 by certificate.

Tremont, O., Rev. T. J. Bacher, 7 by confirmation and 1 by certificate.

The Church of the Cross, Cincinnati, after being thoroughly repaired, was reopened December 21, with appropriate services. The occasion was one of most refreshing interest. Rev. D. Van Hørne, of Dayton, preached with great

acceptance on the morning and evening of the day named. The pastor of the church, Rev. P. C. Prugh, is very much encouraged in his work.

*The question of erecting a new church edifice in Kutztown, Rev. J. S. Herman, pastor, is now warmly agitated.*

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS—*Week of Prayer, January 4-11, 1874.*—The American Evangelical Alliance suggests the following as a suitable plan for the observance of the Week of Prayer throughout the United States:

Sunday, January 4: Sermons—The Unity of the Christian Church; the real oneness of all true believers; hindrances and motives to union; the blessings to be hoped for from the union of believers in prayer.—John 17: 21-23.

Monday, January 5: Confession—Our common unworthiness and guilt. Thanksgiving—For national, domestic and personal mercies, temporal and spiritual. Supplication—For special blessings on the Week of Prayer.—Dan. 9: 7; Mal. 3: 10.

Tuesday, January 6: Prayer—For the Christian church; for her increase in faith, holiness and love; for persecuted and suffering Christians; for Christian liberty; and for the more abundant outpouring of the Holy Spirit.—Col. 1: 9-11; Heb. 13: 3; Hab. 3: 2.

Wednesday, January 7: Prayer for Families—Home and parental influence; sons and daughters; the absent, the sick, the erring; inmates of prisons; all educational institutions.—Ps. 115: 12-14: 144-12.

Thursday, January 8: Prayer for Nations—For peace among men; for public virtue and righteousness; for the banishment of intemperance, dishonesty, infidelity and superstition; and for the diffusion of pure and Christian literature.—Is. 60: 17, 18.

Friday, January 9: Prayer—For the evangelization of all nominally Christian countries; for the conversion of Israel; for seamen; for missionaries; for the spread of the Gospel in Mohammedan and heathen countries; for the conversion of the world to Christ.—Ps. 68: 31; 122: 6.—Heb. 13: 3.

Saturday, January 10: Prayer—For the Christian ministry; for Sunday-schools; for revivals.—Matt. 9: 38; Deut. 4: 9; Hab. 3: 2.

Sunday, January 11: Sermon—Subject: Christ's kingdom universal and everlasting.—Ps. 97: 1, 2. Results of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance.

*One effect of the Evangelical Alliance* will be, to correct erroneous views of the condition of Christianity in America. The common opinion of the educated classes in Germany is, that the United States is practically a heathen country, and this because we have no State church. The venerable Dr. Dorner, of the University of Berlin, has taken an early opportunity, after his return home, to correct this error. In an address, full of cordial feeling toward us, he has explained to a company of theologians the true facts of our religious condition. We copy from the *Tribune's* translation its closing words:

"The Americans feel already that they have a special mission, namely, to march in their fresh, earnest way into the fight against the skeptical and the superstitious, at the same time showing Christianity in a new light, as a living



force, which needs no outward human aid in order to make itself respected but which free spirits most need. Though I have tried to give faithfully some of my chief impressions, my opinion is in no sense that we ought, in church or theology, to abandon the system (national Christianity or popular church) which time and tradition have given us, or to exchange it for another. I have, however, felt it to be a duty to correct many current errors about the United States, and to point out some traits which we ought to copy; *e. g.*, sympathy of all Protestants, amity, mutual esteem, disregard for differences which do not concern the soul, in the place of peevish, narrow, uneasy strife and enmity. The present age demands new and greater tasks. Finally, may the free, open recognition of what is good in other sects, and the readiness for work and sacrifice for God's kingdom—the characteristics of American Christians—be our model. If we march hand-in-hand with America for these ends, the start which our history gives us in many respects will be preserved as a blessing for us—the Evangelical church of the entire globe.”—*The Methodist*.

*The Tone of the Old Church towards the New Church.*—If we may judge from their papers, the feeling of the high-church party towards the Reformed Episcopalians, is one of great bitterness. Already the members of the new body are styled Cumminsites; that the church should be contemptuously called a sect is a matter of course. Yet in what, as to its origin, it differs from the Anglican body, which is itself a secession, does not appear. In nothing, however, is the effect of the new movement more apparent than in the altered tone of “loyal churchmen” toward their Evangelical brethren who still remain in the fold. Heretofore the position of the Evangelicals has been uncomfortable enough. Now the *Church Journal* speaks of the “Old Evangelical School” as possessing a form of thought which, though not accepted by the *Journal*, it nevertheless honors and believes to be “desirable for the round completeness of church life and opinion.”

This is an amazing revelation. What of the prosecution of the younger Tyng for the offense of preaching in a Methodist pulpit? What of the letters of Bishops Tozer and Potter and Dr. Drumm in relation to the Dean of Canterbury? What of the outrageous assaults of such English papers as the *Church Times* on every English bishop of Low Church leanings? What of the sneers at the Queen for communing with Presbyterians? The same number of the *Church Journal* which is so sweet upon the Evangelicals, quotes without disapproval a most contemptuous reference to the Queen from a High Church paper. If the Evangelical party is necessary to the round completeness of the church, it has been upon the condition of being snubbed upon every conceivable occasion and of being persecuted in the persons of its most distinguished representatives.

It is strange that on Anglican principles it should be denied that the Reformed Episcopal body is or can be a church at all. If there is any virtue in apostolic succession (which we hold to be the merest figment), it has that; if any in a Prayer Book, it has that. Yet the *Church Journal* moans as if Christ's body had been rent in twain. It pours out its grief in this strain: “To us, without exaggeration or rhetoric, she (the Protestant Episcopal church) is

the Catholic church of America. If she fail in the land, there is nothing left for it but Popery or individual rationalism, superstition worse than in the tenth century, or the denial of any Father in heaven at all." We pity the mental condition of the *Journal*, but we cannot share in its fears. If its church were blotted out of existence, there would be almost as much acknowledgment of a "Father in heaven" in the land as there is now. There would still be a body of Christ, blessed of Him, and the abiding place of His Spirit. Excellent as are many Protestant Episcopalians, they are but a little flock, and make but a small part of the host of the followers of Christ in the United States. But why should they complain? If the sacred virtue of which they have been, in their own estimation, the exclusive possessors, is dispersed abroad, why should they regret it? why should they not rejoice in the spread of the precious gift?

But, in fact, the position of the Anglican body is the most humiliating known in the ecclesiastical world. Historically it is Protestant, yet it is ever trying to deny its history. It acknowledges the Apostolicity of the Roman Catholic church, and speaks gently of it as "the church of the Papal obedience;" yet Rome scorns its pretensions to be a church at all, and treats its orders with supreme contempt. Turning next to the Greek church it has sued for fellowship there. It has taken the orthodox patriarchs some time to rub their eyes, and to wake up enough to know what the strange phenomenon means. They only remember that ages ago the Bishop of Rome fell away from them; and here is a secession from a secession asking to be recognized as Apostolic. After much effort, answers, vague and general, have been drawn from two patriarchs; we know not if there are more. But is there not a correspondent, officially representative of the Protestant Episcopal church, and is he not doing the work of corresponding with unflagging industry? Away off in Asia or Africa somebody to unite with will be found, and the shivering Anglicans will be warmed with a sense of fellowship somewhere. All this would be very funny if it were not so very sad.

We do not wonder that Bishop Cummins has turned from his farcical performance, and sought fellowship among his Protestant brethren at home. In this he has followed his Christian instincts, and has acted with true manliness. As an Episcopalian he is a Protestant, and can be nothing else. He is of the brotherhood of Protestantism, all of whose faithful members are of the body of Christ. High Church organs may disguise the issue as they will, but there is a distinct reason for the new organization. The Reformed Episcopalians have the logic of the question on their side, and they are not afraid to follow their logic to its legitimate conclusions.

*French Reformed Church.*—In the General Synod of the French Reformed church, which is now in session, a protest was read from forty-two delegates of the Liberal party against the declaration of faith voted in 1872. These delegates declare that they will not desert the principles of liberty, which are the *raison d'être* of Protestantism, and that they cannot take their seats in the Synod so long as it adheres to its decision. The seats on the left were, in fact, deserted, and only sixty-two delegates, instead of one hundred and eight, were present. The Synod voted a resolution declaring that it would not abandon the



principles which had been proclaimed, and which constitutes its system of faith. The reporter of the Permanent Committee of the Synod proposed to ask the government for authorization to publish the declaration of faith of June, 1872, and the ratification of the sanction given to that declaration. In consequence of that sanction, future Protestant pastors would only be able to exercise their ministry on condition that they promised obedience to the declaration of faith.

*Missionary.*—A letter from Foochow, China, October 19th, says that "Our missions in China have so enlarged their borders as to cover a great extent of territory outside the cities by whose names the missions are known. There are preachers and laymen of our church at this annual meeting, some of whom came two hundred miles from the west, and others who came as far from the south, and by far the greater portion of the mission is at a distance from this city. The same, though to a less extent, is true of the other missions." These facts have led to a change in the designation of the several missions. The Peking mission is to be called the "North China Mission;" the Kiukiang Mission is to be the "Central China Mission;" the Foochow Mission, the "East China Mission;" and the Canton Mission, the "South China Mission." Of the Methodist Missions in Germany, the Oldenburg District has had a year of prosperity. The increase of appointments has been 11; of members, 218; of schools 4; of teachers, 40; of scholars, 300; and advance in the church collections for benevolent purposes of 1206 thalers, nearly \$900.

*The Philadelphia Episcopalian*, organ of the straight-out evangelicals, in speaking of the new reformed movement, says: A minister of our church who has means of knowing the subject, has assured us that he can name seventy-five clergymen of our church who would unite in a movement for a new organization if their parishes would go with them. And on the other hand, we know laity who say they would join in such a movement if their ministers would lead the way. So the parties sit looking at each other, sighing and embarrassed, like two lovers both afraid to make any advance, and waiting for the other to give some sign. But where hearts are fixed upon and attuned to one object something usually occurs to bring them together.

*Great Protestant Victory in Pennsylvania—The New Constitution Adopted by 150,000 Majority.*—The *Christian Statesman* says: A most important victory over the enemies of our common school system, and over the Roman Catholic party of the United States, was gained in Pennsylvania on Tuesday last, in the adoption of the New Constitution by an overwhelming majority, notwithstanding the untiring and energetic opposition of the Roman Catholic priests.

That part of the Constitution which called forth the Roman Catholic opposition, were the following sections:

"SEC. 1. The General Assembly shall provide for the maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient system of public schools, wherein all the children of this Commonwealth above the age of six years may be educated, and shall appropriate at least one million of dollars each year for that purpose.

"SEC. 2. No money raised for the support of the public schools of the Com-

monwealth, shall be appropriated to, or used for, the support of any sectarian school.

"SEC. 3. Women twenty-one years of age, and upwards, shall be eligible to any office or control or management under the school laws of this State."

*Nowhere* in modern times have Christian missions been so successful as in Madagascar. Already there are in the island half a million of professing Christians, twenty thousand children at school, and some seven hundred churches. Besides building their own churches and supporting their own ministers, the native Christians maintain a hundred and twenty evangelists in the outlying districts. Polygamy has been abolished, but domestic slavery remains to be dealt with.

The decree of the government of Mexico promulgating religious liberty in the Republic, meets with singular and violent opposition in many places. A correspondent sends an account of some of the excesses committed by the aboriginal Indians, who have pillaged villages under the cry of "Down with Protestants," being doubtless instigated to commit these acts by Catholic emissaries and priests. In some cases the cry has been "Long Live Religion," which clearly indicates that the Papal party see a loss of their influence in the full toleration of other religions.

A building secured for the Jewish Mission of the Free church, has lately been opened in Constantinople. The British Ambassador, Sir Henry Elliot, presided, Missionaries of the British and American Societies were present, and much interest was manifested in the event. The position of Protestantism in Constantinople and throughout Turkey, is said to be becoming more encouraging.

At the annual meeting of the Society of the Howard Mission and Home for Little Wanderers, A. S. Hatch, Shepherd Page, J. S. Howell, Watson Sanford, Caleb B. Knevals, R. G. Cornell, Adon Smith, jr., and Jacob F. Wyckoff were elected trustees.

The Rev. Emile Cook, who was saved in the Ville du Havre, is the well-known French Wesleyan minister of Les Ternes and Roue Roquepine chapels, Paris, who was distinguished during the siege of that city, and afterwards nearly lost his life by the Communists mistaking him for a German.

The Pope has issued an Encyclical, in which, referring to the consecration of Bishop Reinkens, he declares the act of consecration, performed by a Jansenist heretic, to be null and void, and passes sentence of excommunication against the Bishop, his electors, aiders and abettors.

The old church at Longmeadow, Massachusetts, has held Thanksgiving services more than a hundred years, it first having responded to the Governor's proclamation in 1767, and the gallery for the choir is the same as when the singers took their key-note from the ancient chorister's pitchpipe.

The gifts received by Yale College during the year ending June 30th, amount



to \$196,284, which was distributed as follows: To endowment fund, \$167,115; to fellowships, \$10,000; to special department, \$11,000; to scholarships, \$3000. During the same time Harvard received \$158,075.

The reports of the Congregational Association of Massachusetts for 1873 show the number of churches to be 507—an increase of four over last year, of eighteen over ten years ago, of forty-six over twenty years ago, of sixty over 1830, and of 164 over 1800. The number of members is 81,464.—A new church for the people was opened on Sunday, November 30th, in Central Hall, Brooklyn. The Rev. H. O. Pentecost, who has been driven from the pastorate of a Baptist congregation for being more a Christian than a sectarian, is the pastor. The opening services were participated in by two Presbyterians, two Methodists, one Reformed, and one Catholic-Baptist clergymen.—The Seventh-Day Adventists are about to start a Swedish journal to spread their views. They are working with much energy among the Scandinavian settlers in the northwest.—The American Board have decided to help the native churches of Central Turkey in their enterprize of founding a college. The people of Aintab have contributed very liberally towards the establishment of this institution; the Preparatory Department is already in operation, and a wealthy Mussulman has given a beautiful and extensive site for the college buildings. American help is modestly asked for.

The Presbytery of Baltimore have made provision for carrying on the Evangelistic work in that city, which was lately discontinued by the Synod. The Rev. J. Garland Hamner will labor under the direction of a committee of the Synod.—The 63 congregational churches of California report a membership of 2799, and a net gain during the year of 794. Eight of the above named churches are virtually disorganized. On the other hand, seven new churches have been formed, with a membership of 104. There has been a gain of eight Sunday-schools, and an increase of 700 scholars, the whole number of scholars now being 6069.—The Roman Catholics congregations in Italy, especially in Umbria, are one by one adopting the fashion of electing their own parish priest, without asking the bishop's consent.—At a recent meeting of the society for the propagating of the Gospel, Sir Bartle Frere affirmed of the Christian church in India, that its growth far exceeded anything recorded of the primitive church. He held that the power of Christianity was far more potent now than ever it had been.

*The Friend of India* gives the Christian population of Persia as about 25,000 Armenians, and as many Nestorians. Both of these classes are exempt from military duties, and the Armenians no longer suffer persecution for their faith, as formerly.

*Postal Card Decisions.*—Persons should not mail two postal cards joined together, one containing an inquiry, and the other blank, upon which to make a reply. Both will be cancelled at the office of mailing, and the blank one rendered useless.

The following ruling of the Post-office Department has just been made respecting postal cards: These cards are not to be advertised, are not to be returned to the writers, nor sent to the Dead Letter Office. If undelivered sixty days after their receipt they should be burned.

No postal card which contains a scurrilous or obscene communication, or which is folded and the edges fastened together, or to which a slip of paper is attached to conceal the communication, or to which any printed matter, photograph or picture *affixed*, will not be allowed transmission through the mails, nor can two cards be pasted together and transmitted without payment of postage (in addition to the stamps imprinted thereon,) at full letter rates. All such cards will be destroyed at the mailing office. It will, therefore, be well for the public to understand, that whilst anything not scurrilous or obscene can be properly transmitted if written or printed on the card itself, no addition to it, or increase in its weight, will be permitted.

*Bishop Peck* has started from Syracuse for his return trip to the Pacific Coast. He will look after the churches on his way.

A wonderful revival prevails in the three charges of Reading. Three hundred conversions were reported recently, and the interest remains unabated.

According to recent statistics, the Episcopal diocese of Pittsburg is as follows: Ministers, 59; communicants, 3876; Sunday-school teachers, 497; scholars, 4340.

*Rev. J. Q. A. Weller*, pastor of the Pittsburg (English) Mission of the Evangelical Association, writes to the organ of his church that quite a gracious work of revival prevails in his charge.

During Bishop Foster's absence in Europe and South America he traveled twenty-seven thousand miles, including eighty-seven days of ocean travel. He made four trips across the Atlantic.

*Rev. L. N. Stratton*, one of the editors of the *American Wesleyan*, has been seriously ill for some time, partly caused by an overworked brain. He was able to visit the office for an hour recently, according to the latest accounts.

*Charity*, in order to accomplish good, must have hands to help, feet to go about doing good, eyes to weep, and a heart to sympathize with the poor and needy ones. Let each Christian have a word of comfort to whisper to the suffering. Let each one help his neighbor.

*Henry Ward Beecher*, of Plymouth church, Brooklyn, has published the following statistics: "Number of members received into the church during the year, 205; dismissed, 80; average yearly admissions for twenty-six years, 136; whole number received since its organization, 3547. In its three Sunday-schools there are 2746 scholars, with 258 officers and teachers; average attendance for the year, 1815. The church contributed for benevolent objects and home expenses during the year, \$97,335.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—FEBRUARY, 1874.—No. 2.

---

THE LITURGICAL QUESTION.

[So many years have passed since the commencement of the controversy caused by the attempted ritualistic or high-church innovation in our church, that its earlier history and incidents connected therewith, are largely lost sight of, or unknown. And yet without some due knowledge of them, the ruling spirit and aim of those innovations cannot rightly be judged and understood. Some of the tracts and papers called forth by the controversy at its start, or in its earlier stages, have never been seen by many of our friends, and are out of print. And as a desire to read them has been expressed to us several times, we have concluded to republish them in successive issues of the *Monthly*, so as to put them within the reach of our readers.

Among the most important of such papers, are the *majority and minority reports* of the Liturgical Committee, submitted to the Synod of Chambersburg, in October, 1862. The majority report, which is commenced in this and the following pages, was prepared by Dr. J. W. Nevin, endorsed by a large majority of the Committee, and submitted to the Synod as stated above. It is to be taken, therefore, as a deliberate declaration of the views and aims of its author, and of those who gave it their assent and endorsement. It was the first explicit statement of the ruling views and aims of the leaders of the ritualistic movement, the first full announcement to the church of what they held on the subject, and desired to effect.

Its extremely radical and revolutionary character will be manifest. There is hardly one distinctive feature of evangelical Reformed worship or doctrine which it does not directly or implicitly ridicule and assail, and that in no delicate terms. Not only free prayer, but such directories of worship as the Palatine Liturgy, are made alike the butt of its sarcasm or its condemnation.

The real import and bearing of this Report never received the careful consideration which it demanded. As a bold declaration of dissatisfaction with the true spirit and character of the Reformed church, and of a desire, and a purpose also, materially to change both, it is a most offensive document. No one

who loves our church in its historical character can read it without pain and indignation.

It claims to be in harmony with instructions given to the Committee. How false this pretension is, may be seen from some of its own statements and admissions, and will appear still more clearly from our notes appended, and from the minority Report to follow it.

Whilst the Report nominally refers to the Provisional Liturgy of 1857, it really sets forth and defends the Lancaster ritualistic theory of worship, &c., as carried out in the New-order of Worship of 1866. The Provisional Liturgy was a very different sort of book. It contained the germs, indeed, of the later revised Order of Worship, but enveloped in such innocent folds, that few suspected what seems to have been intended by it.

Let this Report be carefully read and pondered. It will be found fully to sustain the charges of radical ritualistic and sacerdotal innovations which have been brought against the Mercersburg-Lancaster movement. The italicising and foot-notes are our own.—*Ed. Ref. Church Monthly.*]

THERE are two general conceptions of the meaning and purpose of a *Liturgy*, which need to be carefully distinguished in any effort which is made to provide for public worship in this way. The conceptions *agree* in this, that they are *alike* opposed to what is called the use of free prayer, in the ordinary sense of the term. But beyond that, they are *so unlike*, that *the difference* between them may be said to be *wider altogether than their common difference from worship in the free form*.\*

1. In the first place, the notion of a Liturgy may be made to include simply *a mechanical directory of the manner in which the services of the sanctuary are to be conducted, with written forms of prayer and other public address, more or less full, thrown together in an outward and prevailingly independent way.*

With very many, this is the only meaning of liturgical worship. A Liturgy in their view, is merely a Prayer Book, in which pre-composed forms are provided for different public occasions, to be used instead of any private productions brought out by the officiating minister at the time. Such a book may be constructed on different plans; may be more or less full; may have single prayers only, or a variety of prayers for the several different occasions of

---

\*This is a very notable admission. It proves that the writer of the Tract, and the committee who endorsed it, saw and felt that *their* theory of worship was entirely opposed, not only to *free* prayer, but to such Liturgical usages as the Reformed church favored. They further confess that free prayer is in more harmony with the Reformed idea of worship, than their theory of worship. And for this theory they plead and argue in opposition to the doctrine and rules of their church, although they solemnly promised to uphold and defend the doctrines and rules of the church.



worship, and may be made of more or less binding authority, or be considered a mere pulpit convenience for altogether optional use. But through all such modifications the general conception remains the same. The Liturgy is a service book, a book of examples and forms, a mere collection of prayers.\*

Much of the controversy we hear concerning the use of liturgies, turns on this notion of them altogether. It is a question simply between book-prayers, as they are called, and prayers without book, the manner and spirit of the worship being supposed to be in both cases substantially the same. Public addresses to God, in the name of the congregation, are held to be a necessary part of the worship of the sanctuary; it is the *business* of the minister to lead the people in these acts of devotion, at such times as the order of service requires; and the matter of debate then is, whether in the discharge of this function he should be left to his own free power and pleasure at the time, or make use of forms previously prepared and printed for the purpose.

In favor of free supplications it is contended, on the one side, that they tend to encourage and assist the spirit of devotion, and the gift of prayer in the officiating minister; that being produced from within at the moment, when they are offered, they may be expected to carry with them proper heart and life; that being wholly unshackled, they have the power of suiting themselves easily to existing circumstances and wants. On all of which points then, counterpart objections are urged against prescribed forms of prayer. They are mechanical, we are told, and run naturally into formality and cold lip service; they are not born immediately from the heart, but are the repetition or rehearsal only of what others have wrought out from the brain; they are necessarily general, allowing no room for such freedom, variety, and particularity, as the idea of prayer seems to require; they prevent the proper cultivation of what has been rightly denominated the gift of prayer, being in this view, at best, crutches only for the lame, and helps for the incompetent, the general use of which cannot but serve to extend and confirm the very weakness for which it thus offers itself as an indulgent relief. The argument throughout is directed against liturgies under the one single

---

\*The kind of Liturgy here meant, is that approved by the Reformed church from the beginning, a Liturgy which, in a free way, should serve as a directory and guide of public worship, and yet allow full room for liberty under the spirit in prayer.

aspect of their being precomposed, fixed forms of prayer, in distinction from corresponding services of an extemporaneous and free character.

And so, also, on the other side, we have the cause of liturgies largely defended under precisely the same view. They are regarded as a security for the fitness, decency, and dignity of the public services of religion. If some ministers are well qualified to produce good prayers without any such outward help, it is certain that very many have not this qualification, and that to a large extent, accordingly, the function is discharged in a very unsatisfactory and most unedifying way. As a general thing, these free prayers are either themselves stereotyped private forms of thought and phraseology, into which the minister has fallen for himself, he can hardly tell how, or else irregular and desultory effusions which are entitled to but small regard on the score of either piety or sense. Why, it is asked, should the devotions of the congregation in this most important part of sanctuary worship, be at the mercy of a single mind, called to impart direction and shape to them at the time? It would be considered monstrous on all hands, if it were pretended to fasten the praises of the congregation in this way to the use of hymns dictated for them at the time by the minister, even allowing such hymns to have been carefully prepared by him for the purpose beforehand. Why, then, should it seem right to commit the solemn service of prayer to such dictation, not generally premeditated, but determined for the most part by the impulses of the moment? Is it right that the whole assembly of God's worshipping people, in thus coming before him and calling upon his name, should be made *to hang not only on the mouth* of the minister, but upon his mind and heart also, for the way in which the approach is made? Is it right that his uncertain powers, his varying frames and dispositions, his humors and caprices, his individual opinions, fancies and prejudices, his peculiarities of thought and diction, should be allowed to thrust themselves in continually as a medium between those who pray, and Him to whom prayer is made, coloring and refracting the universal devotion thus to their own tone? Surely, to one considering the matter properly, this must be counted a worse bondage for the congregation than any which is imposed by the fixed forms of a prayer-book. The confinement of a liturgy, composed with premeditation and care, and accurately understood before-



hand, may justly be regarded as liberty itself, in comparison with any such necessity of following the random lead of another, without any previous knowledge whatever of its extemporized turns and starts. Of all sorts of tyrannical rule, indeed, the most slavish always is that which owns no law, and moves in no fixed orbit, but stands only in the arbitrary will and pleasure of the individual by whom it is exercised. Better in any case an objective form than a purely subjective despotism. It is a great misnomer to call extemporary prayer free. For a congregation, it is just the opposite of this, in proportion precisely as it recedes from the character of some generally acknowledged, though unwritten form, and affects to be wholly original and independent. Your *ranting expectorations*, born from the feeling of the moment, and your eloquently sentimental harangues to the Deity, got up to please the ears of a refined audience, are both alike, in this view, an outrage upon the true freedom of Christian worship.\*

Looking at the matter in this way, the advocates of liturgical worship, in the sense now under consideration, are not willing to allow, of course, that the other system has the advantage of being less outward and more full of devotional life. The use of forms is not necessarily a dead quiescence in forms. There is no reason why the spirit of devotion may not flow actively in such channels of prayer, as well as in the corresponding channels of praise which are offered to it by the spiritual songs of the sanctuary. Nay, on any right view of the case, it will be found that long established, long familiar forms of worship, have a far greater fitness for devotional use than such as are strange and new. There are no such vehicles of pious sensibility as old hymns, old prayers, old religious utterances generally. It is not true that they serve to generate and encourage lifeless formality. Where the spirit of religion is wanting, they may, indeed, furnish opportunity for this abuse; just as the sameness of the Scriptures may become a soporific drug in the same way. But who would think of meeting and correcting this difficulty in the case of the Bible, by throwing the Bible continually into new forms and versions? The old text, for those who

---

\*In this entire rabid paragraph, the writer and his committee *seem* to be stating objections made by others to free prayer. But they are really their own objections. The whole description of free prayer is a shameful caricature. And when it is remembered that what the writer thus rails at, has been the prevailing practice of our church for hundreds of years, that it was the way in which our fathers prayed and taught the people to pray, the railing of the report is simply an outrage upon decency, and upon the memory of our honored dead.

have been all their lives familiar with it, is ever for all devotional purposes the best text. And so is it also with hymns and prayers, catechisms and creeds. Where there is any susceptibility for religious emotions or affections, old formularies, embalmed, as it were, in the sacred memories of the past, are always better adapted to call it into exercise than any that are modern and new. Novelty and variety may stir the understanding, or please the fancy; but they have no power to feed the inward life of the soul. That seeks rather communion with the past, and an intensive appropriation of what is already at hand. Here, emphatically, that word is true: "No man having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new; for he saith, *the old is better*." In religion, the law is universal. Religious sentiment, actually at work in the soul, seeks and finds its most natural outlet always in forms of thought and language which need no invention, but are already at hand, consecrated for the purpose, and made solemnly familiar by long use.\*

Such liturgical forms, in this view, have an immense educational work. It is of vast account to have the mind stored from the beginning with the wholesome words of sound doctrine and right religious feeling, even where the sense of them may not be at first properly perceived or duly laid to heart. Especially important is it, we may say, that such preoccupation of the mind should be secured in the way of forms which utter and act forth, not simply the knowledge of religion, but its actual power and life—the faith of the church in this manner going before the faith of her infants and children, her novices and catechumens, and struggling to form itself in them as the hope of glory. "As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them up, beareth them on her wings," so doth this holy mother of us all fulfill here her sublime office of winning the fledglings of baptismal grace to a true heavenward flight. There is no teaching in religion like this *in-forming* process, which puts into the soul, with divine authority, the outward word of religion, in order to make room for the coming of the same word in its inward power and glory. If it may be said with truth, that the familiar songs and ballads of a nation are of more power for the character of it than its laws, there is still more room to affirm of these

\*All this is mere plausible deception. The writer, as he often does, sets up a misrepresentation that he may blind people to actual facts. He picks out bad exceptions to suit his purpose, and so as to have something to strike at.



established forms of Christian belief and worship, that they go far beyond all other modes of culture in determining what turns out to be at last the actual institution of nominally Christian men. Catechisms for the young, in this way, are of more account than systems of theology for the old. Hymns are perpetual sermons. Texts of Scripture stuck in the mind like proverbs, enforce their own lessons, where all commentaries are dumb or forgotten. What a world of education is comprehended, in this way, in the articles of the Creed, and in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. Do *they* lose their force by repetition? Are *they* formal, because they are familiar? Would it be an improvement to have them continually in new paraphrases and versions, or to have them superseded altogether by free effusions extemporized for the same purpose and use? There is irony, as all can at once feel, in the very question. These simple formularies are powerful for the purposes of devotion and faith, just because they echo in the same words always, from childhood to old age, and from one century onward to another, what has been the universal worship of the one Catholic church through all times. And why should we not learn from this the importance of uniform liturgical services generally, for the best kind of religious training, that namely which casts the mind from the beginning into the very mould of the "things which are most surely believed" among Christians, and stamps it at the same time with their ineffaceable image and superscription? A good Liturgy is an organ of religious education, more efficient even than a good Catechism or a good confession of faith. It reaches farther and works deeper. The Prayer-book of the Church of England has more to do with her theological spirit than the Thirty-nine Articles. Every church needs such a help in her prophetic office, even if she might afford to undervalue it in her priestly office. Without it, her educational apparatus, at best, can never be more than half complete.\*

\*Much of what is here said would be readily admitted. But his own purpose carries the writer entirely too far. Written, prescribed Liturgies, have never been found more powerful to preserve orthodoxy and to promote true piety than the system of free prayer. The Episcopal church of England has had what is generally considered one of the best liturgies ever prepared, so that our committee made it almost the model of their own. And yet that very church is more corrupted with error in doctrine and practice than any other nominally protestant evangelical church in that country. In like manner we may ask, were the Lutheran churches of Europe preserved from rationalism and irreligion by being much more liturgical than the Reformed? Where have Puseyism and Pantheism most prevailed? And once more, what power has the "Apostles' Creed" to keep Lancaster theology from running into all sorts of fantastic notions, even to the extent of Pantheism, notwithstanding the great veneration for that creed professed by Lancaster?

Here, then, the friends of free worship are themselves put on their defence, in a case where they have been trying to make out a charge of religious indifference against the other side. If there be any truth in what has now been said, the system for which they plead as being most favorable to the life and power of religion, is opposed to one of the most necessary conditions of all true Christian prosperity and growth. Unliturgical churches can have no full sympathy with the idea of educational religion, and it must necessarily suffer deplorable neglect at their hands. If they lay any stress at all on religious training, it will be in the view of it which makes it to be only a proper course of instruction in the doctrines and duties of Christianity. But important as this may be, it is by no means the whole, nor yet the main part, of what we are to understand by educational religion. This does not consist in lessons simply for the understanding, or in precepts for the right conduct of life; it is the living discipline of the soul rather into the very form and habit of religion itself—what St. Paul calls the bringing up of Christian children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Such education calls for the use of the Catechism; but it requires yet more the use of positive acts of devotion in fixed liturgical forms. These are as necessary to the growth of piety in children, as their daily meals are to the growth of their bodies. But for this there can be no proper provision, of course, in churches which eschew liturgies altogether, and look upon them as narcotics rather than tonics for the religious life. Even so far as they may find it necessary to allow any education of the sort in the simple prayers of the nursery, it will be with the feeling that all such worship is a mechanical go-cart merely, which must as soon as possible be laid aside, in order to make room for worship in a free, self-moving form; while the services of the sanctuary are so ordered, as from the beginning to force the tender mind of childhood into another manner of religious culture altogether. In circumstances like these, the idea of Christian nurture is shorn of its whole significance and force; and it will be found, accordingly, that these unliturgical churches, as a general thing, make no earnest account, either theoretically or practically, of the great interest of covenant, educational religion; that they have no proper faith in the idea of sacramental grace which lies at the foundation of it; and that their tendency, at least, is always toward that opposite scheme, by which all religion resolves itself,



at last, into a system of private opinions and purely individual feelings. It is historically certain, that the unliturgical usage in all churches in which it has prevailed since the time of the Reformation, has been attended with a progressive movement, more or less decided, in this bad direction. No thoughtful mind turned toward the subject can well help seeing and feeling that there is in some way an ominous affinity between free worship and free thinking in religion, both in its fanatical and its rationalistic polar extremes. Cold Unitarianism and blazing Methodism, or say the inward light of Quakerism in George Fox, and the inward light of the same Quakerism in Elias Hicks, alike opposed in their genius to fixed devotional forms, show a common opposition also to the whole conception of a true churchly Christianity; and along with this, as a matter of course, a common indifference to the whole idea of a true Christian nurture in the Lord.\*

One may see the importance of public liturgical worship by considering how, in its absence, even the primary and most necessary forms of religious confession and devotion are apt to fall into disuse, and to become thus in the end as strange almost to the family and the school as they are to the church. It is not too much to say, that the Lord's Prayer itself, in such circumstances, can never be held in proper honor and use. Where the unliturgical spirit prevails, it seems to have no proper home even in the Christian sanctuary. We have whole religious denominations among whom its voice is scarcely ever heard in pulpit devotion. And what shall we say of the creed, the Apostles' Creed, the old, glorious oriflamb of Christ's sacramental host from the beginning? Where, among unliturgical churches, do we find it lifted up as a standard, from Sabbath to Sabbath, in the name of the Lord? In such churches the Creed is never brought into use at all as a part of worship. Its introduction in this way would be regarded generally, indeed, as an exceptional singularity, a novelty not to be admired or approved. Thus practically disowned in the sanctuary, the devotional symbol finds no home either in the family. It is a most significant fact, well worthy to be noted and laid to heart. Unliturgical denominations are without the creed, as an educational form of faith and piety. It is not recited in their

---

\*These are sweeping extravagant assertions not sustained by facts. Some churches without such Liturgies have shown more educational power than some others which make great account of them.

households, nor taught to their children. For the most part, indeed, the power even of repeating it is lost. With the great body of the people it is gone out of memory and out of knowledge. Let this be taken as of itself an overwhelming example to show how poorly qualified all such denominations are to care properly for what we have seen to be the true idea of educational religion.

Here, then, altogether is a most grave defect, which might well be urged against the system of extemporary prayer, as a full offset at least to its claim of superior life and spirituality, even if this were allowed to be valid. But the claim itself is disputed. There may be, indeed, more semblance of life where the mind is thus put upon the task of producing both the matter and form of prayer on the spur of the moment; but it is a mistake to assume at once that this proceeds from the true spirit of devotion. To a large extent, it must be referred to the mere mental working that is engaged in the exercise, which is no index or measure whatever of the working of the heart. It would seem to be plain rather that the immediate, natural effect of such a strain upon thought, must be a diversion of vital energy from the function of feeling. The two processes are entirely different. The activity of invention is one thing, the activity of devotion is another thing altogether. In this view it is not unreasonable to say, that prepared, long familiar forms, offer on the whole a better solicitation and a more favorable outlet for the spirit of devotion, than any possible utterances extemporized for the purpose. Where the devotional mind is wanting, they become, of course, forms only, and nothing more; like the wheels in Ezekiel's vision, that had no proper motion except by the power of the living spirit that was in them. But where the devotional mind is wanting, extemporaneous prayer is itself only another phase of formality, more offensive, we may say, than that of the prayer-book; even as the spasmodic workings of a galvanized corpse are more unsightly and hideous than the features of the same corpse in a state of repose. Better at any time for a worshiping congregation, if to such mournful masking it must come, the mummery of ritualistic forms, in themselves decent and well composed, than the mummery of prayers that mouth the heavens without either form or life. But this is not the alternative on which to base any proper comparison of the two systems of worship. Let the devotional spirit, the inward fitness for worship, be at hand. Then, we say, it will flow into easy,



vigorous exercise by the use of liturgical forms—the wonted and well-worn channels of previous devotional thought—much more readily, as a general thing, than by the aid of any extemporaneous inspirations whatever.\*

(*To be continued.*)

---

IMMANUEL.

THIS is one of the many significant titles applied to our Redeemer. No single title would be sufficient to tell what He is in Himself, and what He is to us, and has done for us. Indeed, the whole of them fail to declare all that He is.

How could earthly words of human thought and speech fully express divine and heavenly things? Man's words, like himself, are finite. Divine realities are infinite. If man's hand cannot span the heavens, how can man's thoughts or words span and comprehend Him, or the fullness of grace and truth of Him of whose glory the heavens are but a faint reflection?

Nevertheless, the words used to declare to men what God is, do so most truly, and as far as it is possible for us, in our present state, to know Him; and, also, as far as it is needful for us to know Him. There is no deception in those words. They mean all they say, and more than human words can express. Only that *more* must always be in entire harmony with the true meaning of the words themselves.

So of the title *Immanuel*. Its literal meaning is: *God with us*. It is used to tell us that *Jesus* is Jesus; that is, Saviour, as God with us. Hence, this name reveals a blessed fact and truth in regard to Him, well worthy of our most careful and devout consideration.

It is true this title is applied in the Bible but twice to our Redeemer—once in Isaiah (7: 14), and then in Matthew (1: 23). In Matthew it is quoted from Isaiah, chiefly to show that the pro-

---

\*Thus far, even, it is plain enough what the committee intended. The worst case possible is made against free prayer, and what we may call a free liturgy, such as our church has from the first recognized as sufficient. This is done to pave the way for presenting, in the most favorable light, the pet theory of the committee in regard to worship. We shall see, as the report proceeds, how skillfully but deceptively and unfairly this is done.

phesy and hope of the Old Testament were fulfilled and realized in Jesus.

Undoubtedly, there are good reasons why this name is applied to our Redeemer but twice, whilst those other titles, Jesus, Christ, Lord, are so often used. The two principal reasons for this are plainly indicated in the Scriptures. They are, first, because these other titles set forth His special character or person and work, as God manifest in the flesh; and, secondly, because we are most concerned to know Him as Jesus Christ our Lord. He is Immanuel, that He may be Jesus. He needed to be Immanuel, that He might be Jesus. We can rightly know, believe in, and love Him as Immanuel only when we have learned to know Him, and have been led to believe in Him, under a sense of our deep need of Him, as Jesus Christ our Lord.

But although this particular name is used but twice in the Holy Scriptures, the fact or truth which it expresses, "God with us," is often stated and taught, and may be found in many places. The people of God, under the Old Testament dispensation, were familiar with it, in the sense peculiar to that dispensation. They knew God not only as Jehovah, whose throne was in the highest heavens, and who, as king of kings, ruled over all things in majesty and might. They knew Him not only as being present with His people in a general way, by His own presence, or in some more special way by His particular providence. Beyond this, and as still more comforting than this, they knew Him as sustaining a far closer relationship to them by His *abiding personal nearness to them, and presence in their midst.*

To their fathers—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—God had granted occasional manifestations of such nearness. But unto Israel, in the journey through the desert, the Lord gave an assurance and proof of His constant presence in the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night; and even more impressively in the abode of the Shekinah over the mercy-seat in the tabernacle, and afterwards in the temple. This fact of God's presence among them is often mentioned, and is gloried in as the highest privilege and chief joy of His people. "The Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge. "God is in the midst of Zion, therefore she shall not be moved." "In all their afflictions He was afflicted, and the angel of His presence went with them." "There will I commune with them from between the mercy-seat." "What



nation is there so great, that hath God with them, as the Lord is with us in all things that we call upon Him for."

*How they thought* of Him as thus present with them, and believed in His presence, may be easily learned from what is said on the subject in many passages in the Old Testament. One thing is certain, that every pious and truly enlightened Israelite always remembered that however near God might draw to them, and however constantly He might dwell among them, He was ever near and present as *God*, infinitely exalted above them in His being and attributes. Another fact is equally clear, and worthy to be noted. It is, that no true Israelite, holding to the pure faith of the patriarchs and the prophets, ever thought of God as in any way mixed up in His nature or essence with the visible or material symbols of His presence. Their faith kept His being infinitely and sacredly distinct from the substance of the signs or tokens He might use to manifest the reality of His presence.

It is also pleasant and instructive to note another fact in this connection. God was known under the old covenant as dwelling with His people, not only in the associate or organized capacity, but as *single persons* or *individuals*, also. He was, therefore, not merely with the nation or the *church*, as a whole, and by means of some formal public ordinances, but also willing to assure the heart of each member of the nation or church of his indwelling Spirit and sustaining grace. This is taught in those precious words of Isaiah (57: 15): "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy. I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones."

O, how much more comforting must this doctrine have been for "an Israelite indeed," than the vain and superstitious notions of those heathen who held that their gods were with them and in them, by being a part of their very substance and life! For there were heathen in those days who taught and believed that men were *emanations* from the substance and being of God, and who, therefore, regarded themselves as having theanthropic (that is, god-man) *natures*, by reason of some mysterious organic connection with the God-head, as they conceived it.

All these Old Testament views of God as *Immanuel*, were, however, only partial intimations and foreshadowings of what should

be fully realized under the dispensation of the new covenant of grace. They must have been unspeakably comforting, as far as they went, and served to prepare the mind and heart for still better things to come. Those better things were realized in the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. In Him, emphatically in the highest sense, and in a sense altogether peculiar to Him, we have "God with us," as "the Word become flesh," to dwell among us. He is "God with us," not as God was in the "burning bush" to Moses, nor as God was in the Shekinah, nor only as God dwelt by His Spirit with the spirit of the contrite and the humble Israelite of old. In Jesus we have God actually abiding in a human body—the nature of God the Son in real union with a nature like our own, and miraculously prepared out of the substance of human nature; that is, "the seed of the woman." In Him, therefore, we see "God in human flesh appear;" the fullness of the God-head bodily. God in Christ is the closest approach of God to man of which it is possible to conceive, and the most intimate form in which it is possible to think of God as being with men. Taking the words in their right sense, He became "flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone," just as, taken in a proper sense, we are said to be made through faith, "members of His flesh, His body and His bones."

It would be a very great and grave error, however, to think and hold that the human nature in which the Word became flesh, was an emanation from the substance of the nature of God. The Bible expressly teaches the contrary, and declares that the human nature of our Lord Jesus Christ was "prepared" by the almighty power of God, in the nature of the Virgin Mary.

So, again, it would be wholly contrary to the Scriptures to think that Jesus Christ is Immanuel, in the sense that His divine nature entered into such a union with the human nature He assumed, that the two natures were fused into one, so making a *God-man nature*. To think or hold this, would not only be against what the Bible teaches concerning Christ, as God manifest in the flesh, but still more against what it teaches concerning the infinite and eternal nature of God Himself.

Such views of Immanuel are not to be rejected only because they are wrong, unscriptural in themselves, but because they involve other serious errors relating to the work of redemption. They start in false views of Christ, lead to false views of grace,



and are likely to end in an utter perversion of the Gospel way of salvation.

Why Jesus was Immanuel in the Gospel sense, is likewise clearly declared to us. It was, namely, that *He might be Jesus for us*; that He might be able in His human nature to bear the penalty of our sins, "suffer the just for the unjust, to bring us to God," and so, in that nature, be "the Lamb of God to take away the sins of the world."

According to the Scriptures, therefore, the incarnation *was* in order to redemption; it *was* a means to an end; God *did* come and dwell with us, in this form and manner, because in infinite condescending love and mercy He, the Lord and Master, was willing to "serve for our sins," and "give Himself a ransom for many."

These are precious old Gospel truths, of which we must allow no false philosophy (vainly so called) to rob us. They have often been objected as shallow, mechanical and unphilosophical. We need not care for that. Waters are not always shallow because so clear that the bed of the stream may be easily seen. Lake George, in New York State, is said to be four hundred feet deep at some places, and yet pebbles can be easily discerned on the bottom, whilst the muddy waters of a pool through which a dwarf might wade may seem profoundly deep.

If our Gospel faith is to yield to every puff of error which false teachers may seek to circulate, we should be kept busy, indeed, in shifting our sails to the veering winds.

But it is not enough to know that Jesus is Immanuel; that is, God with us. We need personally to make sure of our own immediate saving interest in this wonderful and blessed truth. He became *Immanuel-Jesus* for the world, that each poor lost sinner might find Him such for himself.

Are we, then, "in Him and He in us," in the sense of our being united to Him by faith, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and of our being *reconciled* unto God by His "*peace-speaking blood*?" Have we learned to know Him, by the blessed assurance of enlightened faith, as our Immanuel? Let each one ponder this question earnestly, as a question of life, and not rest until He has found Him, and receive Him whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets foretold as the great and only *Immanuel-Jesus*, "God with us," to save His people from their sins.

"WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?"—ISAIAH 21: 11.

THE night in our Reformed church has been long, but the day seems to be dawning. True, we must for awhile yet "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." Jude 3. We must have some patience yet. But the final issue is hardly any longer uncertain.

How does it stand to-day with our Zion in regard to the new Ritualistic movement, that had crept in unawares until it had grown to such proportions that it claimed already to be *the Reformed church*—claimed to speak its voice, to represent its doctrines, to exercise its authority, and willing to tolerate only for a brief period that which opposed it? Watchman, what of the night? What are its signs of promise?

Seven years ago (1866), when the second General Synod met in Dayton, Ohio, matters looked indeed gloomy and foreboding for the future Reformed church. The Revised Liturgy had just been brought out. The earlier opposition of Drs. Berg, Heiner and Zacharias, had been completely crushed out. The new views had been so widely diffused among the younger members of the ministry, and the older ones were so timid in respect to publicly coming out for the old historical faith, that the New-order men came to that Synod with the highest hopes of getting the new doctrines fully endorsed, and of obtaining the adoption of the new ritual in the church. Indeed, it was repeatedly and openly claimed, that the venerable Eastern Synod had fully and formally endorsed the same, and that it was now the full wish of the church, as spoken by her highest judicatory, that the people should regard the same as the actual faith and order of the Reformed church in the United States.

"Why oppose this thing?" we were told; "you only oppose the work of the Holy Spirit. You only place yourselves in the way of a powerful and resistless movement that is pervading all the denominations. It will be a great credit if we in the Reformed church take the van of Protestantism. What will you do? we have all the institutions, colleges, seminaries, church papers, on our side? Would it not be better to submit at once? You will have to submit in the end, at any rate."

But resistance was made, and has been steadily maintained until



the present day, and will probably be continued until the Mercersburg heresy is fully overcome.

What of the night? Has there been any fruit to this controversy of seven years?

Certainly there has, as is openly acknowledged on all sides. That man must be blind, indeed, who cannot see that a great deal *has been gained* in this time, and that a very effectual stop has been put to the power and spread of Mercersburgism.

1. The boast that all the colleges, seminaries and papers of the church are in favor of Mercersburg, although almost true then, is no longer true. More than half of them are now opposed to Mercersburg, as such, and in full sympathy with the old historical faith.

2. The Mercersburg doctrines and the liturgical practices of that school, have never received the sanction of the highest judicatories of the church; and it is confessed by all intelligent observers that there is now no probability that they will ever be so endorsed. The new-order of worship, if submitted to the Classes, could not obtain the vote of a majority of the Classes; it is very doubtful whether one-third of them would vote in favor of its adoption. We are ready, and willing, and anxious to see the trial made.

3. The Revised Liturgy has never been submitted to a vote of adoption or rejection by the General Synod, or by the Classes. It is well known that its friends are afraid so to submit it. They acknowledge that if so submitted it would be voted down, not only by the Classes, but also by the congregations. No argument or entreaty can induce them to agree to such a reference.

4. The last General Synod was decidedly opposed to the whole Mercersburg movement. It repeatedly voted so as to express its disapprobation. If God continues to favor us, we doubt not all succeeding General Synods will continue in the same way to use their influence, if not their authority, against these novelties.

5. In various portions of the church *the people* (individually and by congregations), are manifesting their dissatisfaction with the whole movement. Just in proportion as it becomes clearly understood, in its spirit and aims, are the good people at outs with it; and they manifest this in a variety of ways.

6. Quite a number of the leading Mercersburg ministers and members have brought to light the character and tendency of the

whole system, by passing openly over to Rome (just as it was predicted at Dayton that they would). It is worthy of special note, that one of the Mercersburg men, writing in the *Messenger*, states openly that *Forney* passed over to Rome because he foresaw that the *ritualistic movement could not triumph* in the Reformed church. He foresaw its complete downfall, and therefore forsook the ship. This is quite creditable to his sagacity and intelligence. We regard this judgment as quite correct. We think there is now not the remotest prospect that the Revised Liturgy can ever be adopted in the Reformed church. There is much less prospect of this now than there was six years ago, or even three years ago. Its case is practically *hopeless*. It is acknowledged now that, even apart from doctrinal and ritualistic errors, it is not even a successful book *after its own order and kind*. In practice it is found to be "heavy, tedious and unedifying." But no revision even will save it. The men, papers and institutions, who were once so influential in such matters, have to a great extent lost their influence, and they feel it very sensibly. They differ greatly among themselves, quietly drop some of their new views, modify and explain away others, seek to give them such a turn as will make them apparently consistent with the Heidelberg Catechism. They no longer seek to lord it over the whole American church, and denounce all outside of their circle as Puritans, Rationalists, pseudo-Protestants. They now find themselves quite fully occupied in explaining away and defending their own errors. To a considerable extent the false feathers with which they had decked themselves, have been brushed away; and it is seen on all hands that they have no such amount of general theological knowledge and insight as was formerly supposed and assumed. They claimed that the Mercersburg movement was identical with modern evangelical theology; but, unfortunately, it has turned out that this is not so, and that in truth they had no real acquaintance with that theology. They did not know what it was. It has become plain that much of their boasted system consists of *disjecta membra* of various and irreconcilable systems, rendering it impossible for them to remain consistent with themselves or their principles.

We believe, too, that it is true that, while a considerable number of their best men have gone over to Rome, others are quietly withdrawing their confidence, and becoming more and more



decided in favor of the old Reformed faith, in opposition to all philosophy, falsely so called.

Let us take heart, then, and stand together a little while longer.

J. H. G.

---

#### THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND LANCASTER.

A CHARACTERISTIC article appeared some weeks ago, written probably by Dr. T. G. Apple, in which the Evangelical Alliance is described as it appears from Lancaster, when looked at through the glasses they use at that place when observing anything that relates to the Evangelical Protestantism of the world, and especially all that pertains to the Evangelical Alliance. It appears in the department of Theology and Criticism, and does duty, no doubt, in the *critical* part of that remarkable department. As to its authorship, it is to be found among the Professors at Lancaster, and *may* be from the pen or heart of him who once before assailed the Alliance. It is a sad proof of how *small great* men can sometimes make themselves, while they are unconscious of their labor. It is pervaded by the spirit of spite and disappointment, under the guise of candor and honorable criticism, but is really impelled by feelings such as those of a spoiled maiden who has been overlooked in the invitations to the last party, or of some aspiring politician whose prëminent qualifications were ignored in the late nominations of his party. The writings indicate soreness, and yet the evident soreness is attempted to be hidden. While tens of thousands all over the Christian world are rejoicing in the assembling and utterances of this great Protestant and Christian Alliance, there are those who deem it their unlovely vocation to criticise, find fault and misrepresent it. Among these is the writer in question, who appears to echo and defend the words and cherish the feelings of some one who is allowed to give them vent in *Lippincott's Magazine*, who said of the Alliance and its late meeting in New York, "It was really a vast movement of the Presbyterian church. Geneva and Calvin were the exclusive proprietors. Episcopalians, Unitarians and Baptists, Methodists and Universalists, were requested to stand aside." The Lancaster writer has, perhaps, not the same sympathy with Unitarians

and Universalists that the magazine correspondent has ; but, then, while he is the champion of churchliness and sacerdotalism, they unite in their antipathy for Presbyterianism. And while this is put forth, occasion is taken to assault Dr. Schaff who, it is more than insinuated, gave the Alliance its Presbyterian character. Another grave charge is, that Lutheranism—the *conservative or Fritschel* Lutheranism—was not accounted of as it should be, and that Dr. Krauth, having read his essay, sat apart and gloomy, taking no part further in the proceedings. This may be so. We were not there to see. Yet it may not have been for any fault in the Alliance. It is very possible that both Dr. Krauth and Dr. Nevin did not feel themselves in a congenial atmosphere. It was too evangelically warm and pure for them. Their cheerless philosophy and *objective* religion may have so disposed them. It is very evident that even Lancaster feels that Dr. Nevin's essay created no enthusiasm in that soul-inspiring council. Even for this the Alliance may not have been to blame. Perhaps that essay was so profound that the provincial minds of his audience could not grasp it? We hope that Lancaster philosophy will console Dr. Nevin's votaries, and that Dr. Krauth may find a more congenial body some day. We have not seen his "philosophical" essay, as it did not appear in our *New York Tribune*, nor do we know whether its excellencies were appreciated by that "one-sided body." Dr. Conrad, of the Lutheran church, also, who was in the Alliance, and whose essay, a very interesting one, on a practical subject, was well received, does not seem to have got on his "high-horse," nor sat apart as one of Homer's gloomy heroes, but rejoices in the Alliance, and felt not that he was "ruled or swallowed up" by the Presbyterians and Calvinists, or even the Puritans. But, then Dr. Conrad did not have a philosophical essay, and does not belong to the ritualistic wing of Lutheranism, and is not in such favor at Lancaster as Krauth and Fritschel. We are clearly of the opinion, that Lancaster should forgive the Alliance for not being enthusiastic over the essays of their friends—the mediocre minds of that little affair could not comprehend them.

But to return to the criticism as regards Presbyterian "preponderance" in the Alliance, we fail to see it unless it be numerical, which can be accounted for by the numerous branches of that faith in our own country, Scotland, Ireland and Canada.



As we said, we were not eye-witnesses. At our distance, reading the reports of the doings; reading the essays and speeches; trying to find the animus of the council, we are bound to say that we cannot see any attempt to put forward arrogantly the peculiarities of Presbyterianism. We can see no attempt to rule the assembly for denominational or sectarian ends. Nor were we aware that any attempt had been made to "swallow up" Dr. Schneck, Dr. Anderson—the Dean of Canterbury—Lord Churchill, Dr. Stoughton, Dr. Rigg, Prof. Dörner, Dr. Christlieb, Dr. Fisch, and Cohen Stuart, etc., etc. This were too daring an attempt for even those naughty followers of Calvin. Surely, those who were of the Alliance have not brought this charge, not even the Episcopalian, English or American, and it remains for *Lippincott* to speak of animosities, Bishop Tozer of violated canons, and *Lancaster* of failures. *Lancaster* finds fault that *Lutheranism* was not there to speak a *great Lutheran word*. (*Is this the voice of Dr. Apple?*) That is just what was *not* the object of the Alliance. It was not the time or place chosen to speak *Lutheran* or *Reformed words*, great or small, nor great Baptist or Presbyterian, Methodist, or any denominational *words*. Why, then, find fault? Conrad was there, Kelker was there, Dr. Tholuck was heard, and they only cared to speak a *great word* for Christ and Protestantism over against Rome, Puseyism, and Infidelity. The Alliance was not called, and all men knew the fact, to hear such words as might suit *Lancaster*; and if that is desirable, let *Lancaster* and those who sympathize with it, call their council and discuss "the differences of Protestantism;" or, if it is advisable, its *weakness* and "its failures," but do not blame the Alliance for that which it never was contemplated should be done by it.

*Lancaster* is also disgruntled because the Alliance did not set the churchly against the unchurchly side of Protestantism, and form a ring and fight it out. Any one might ask, what would be the benefit? A few churchly gladiators would be delighted to show their skill and their millenery, and that would be all except the resultant animosities. But why find fault with the Alliance for failing to get this show for the delight of a few that could take interest in it? How much would it do to unite the church of the living God in the work of the world's salvation? If this must be done, then let *Lancaster* and its confederate churchly high-churchmen prepare for the tournament, and if they can find any

one who has nothing better to do than waste his time in a bout with them, than go at it and have it out. It would do just the same amount of good that a convention of "the Woman's Rights" advocates and their opposers would accomplish, and no more.

Lancaster yet finds fault that the Alliance was not made an arena where Romanism and Protestantism should be made to assert their claims over against each other. All well, at the proper time and place; but it is an unjust and improper criticism of the Alliance to find fault for this, when it was no part of its work undertaken. When this is done, the Christian church must know and understand it. It had been an imposition for the Alliance at New York to turn itself into a grand debate between the chosen champions of Rome and Protestantism. This has been done on a small scale; and if the results on a large scale are to be of the same kind, then were Christ's cause well delivered of any part in it. It is the option of Lancaster, or of those who affiliate with it, to summon the Christian world to such a Congress as this. Let some one be found with the untiring energy of Dr. Schaff, to make it a success. But if, on the one hand, Rome's most bland and subtle sons appear, and, on the other, Lancaster and extreme Lutheranism and high-church Episcopacy, *what would there be to discuss?* Should, however, some erratic Puritans or Rome-hating German Presbyterians enter the lists against the errors and pretensions of the man of sin, what would Lancaster do? Where would Drs. Nevin, Gerhart, Apple, Higbee, Gans, etc., etc., take sides? Let Wagner, Wolff, Ermentrout, etc., the *Mercersburg Review* and the columns of the *Messenger*, answer. We fear that the Protestantism of the Eightieth Question of our Catechism would be surrendered without a tilt of spears.

It may subject us to the suspicion that we are a Yankee, but, nevertheless, we are curious to know whether the Rev. Profs. Dorner and Christlieb were pressingly invited to visit Lancaster; whether its hospitalities were warmly tendered them; whether Krummacher or Kraft were cordially bidden to become guests of *our* professors and doctors; or, if they were, why they did not accept the invitations? They were honored at Princeton—some, if not all of them. We are also curious to see a critique on the essays of Drs. Dorner and Christlieb, from the pens of our Lancaster philosophers and *Protestants*. Can we have it? May we not hope to see it in the department of "*Criticism?*" It would



*The Divided House; or, The Two Tendencies. 77*

be fully as interesting, no doubt, as the criticism of the *defects* and *failure* of the Alliance. Why is it that Lancaster always finds fault with all that is done in the Protestant church? Who knows?

We were sorry to see the article against the Alliance from Lancaster. First, because it makes common cause with Infidelity, Romanism, Ritualism, and Bishop Tozer. Second, because it blames the Alliance for not doing what it was not formed to do, and which, if attempted, would have injured it and gratified its enemies. Third, because it is unmanly and uncandid. It evidences a spirit so selfish, that it causes one to blush for the dignity of humanity. Lastly, because it had been better quietly to prepare to carry out what they insist should be done, and thus earn an honor of their own kind and for their own work.

CALVIN.

---

THE DIVIDED HOUSE ; OR, THE TWO TENDENCIES.

(Continued.)

It may seem a mark of perverse infatuation that a church should give loose reins to two rival tendencies to propagate themselves to their maturity in her own bosom. Yet, at Philadelphia it was done, and from that day the two antagonistic tendencies were authorized to do their utmost in carrying out their views.

It should not be complained at Cincinnati that its fruits are ready for harvesting, for that which a man soweth shall he also reap. Not only was this act suicidal, but had it been by any other church, or another majority, these Mercersburg men would probably have declared it an evidence of the absence of the Holy Ghost from its councils. The *Reformed church*, as such, is not responsible for this deed, and must not be held responsible for the fact that rival tendencies were let loose on her soil, there to contend for supremacy over or division of her territory. It was clearly an unconstitutional act to authorize the two tendencies, as represented by the two Liturgies, the freedom of use in the churches. When the general Synod at Dayton, under this same ritualistic majority, said that the Liturgy was "allowed as an order of worship proper to be used in the congregations and the

families of the Reformed church," it was a palpable evasion of Article 80 of the Constitution, and an infraction upon the rights of the Classes. And yet Dr. Fisher, an avowedly zealous guardian of the Constitution, was there when this was done. One might have thought that "he *was* talking, or he was pursuing, or he was on a journey, or peradventure, he was sleeping." For all the consequences growing out of the *free* use of both liturgies and their untrammelled permission to work strife, bitterness and division, *the church is not responsible.* Her power to forbid was fettered, and the controlling majority at Dayton and Philadelphia must be held responsible by the church and by God for the mischief done. We shall not now attempt to trace these two tendencies thus let loose in the church to their origin. It suffices to say, that they grew out of the unreformed theory of doctrine, called Mercersburg theology, and the antagonism which this new doctrine awakened in the church. These are embodied in the two rival Liturgies. One adheres to the doctrines as formally set forth by the Reformers, and adheres to the order of worship, in the main then adopted; the other is instinct with the unreformed doctrine of Mercersburg, and its usages and mode of worship is made to conform, in a large degree, to the *ante*-Reformation pattern, and is declared to be not after the manner and belief of the Reformed church at any period. "It is not the pattern according to which our fathers worshiped in these United States or elsewhere." Around these Liturgies the two tendencies gather up their force and make the two parts of this divided family. Let us now recapitulate. *a.* The records show that the Reformed church is divided in sentiment as touching worship and fundamental points of doctrine. This difference is so wide that the two tendencies cannot unite in the practical work of the church—not even in home missions. They use differing Liturgies. They have separate colleges and seminaries. They are educating each its own ministry. It is dividing congregations. This, surely, is a divided house.

*b.* These tendencies, so irreconcilable, were recognized by the General Synod at Philadelphia, and were authorized to work themselves freely without being trammelled in any direction. Thus were they allowed to develop themselves according to the germ they contained. If that germ was Puritanism, Rationalism, or Infidelity, as was declared of our tendency, then Synod said: work out the result, we will allow no consistory or congregation to



*The Divided House; or, The Two Tendencies.* 79

hinder you. If, on the other hand, the germ of superstition and Romish idolatry was in the other tendency, as was earnestly alleged, why, the Synod said to it, you are free; if your tendency is to Ritualism and Rome, why, then, go there, and no congregation or consistory must forbid you.

c. The church has never authorized this; never set these tendencies free to wage a war in her bosom and fight their way to their results. The Synods at Dayton and Philadelphia assumed the authority to do this; refused to permit the church in its proper courts (the Classes) to determine the matter, but in the face of the Constitution rashly set in motion the forces that now divide the church.

d. Both the Synods at Dayton and Philadelphia were controlled by a majority that was led by Dr. Nevin, and "the rest of us" who adhere to the use of the new-order of worship, and glory in the Mercersburg theology. This accidental majority, by usurping the power of the Classes and violating the spirit of the Constitution, have wrought the terrible harm to the church complained of at Cincinnati.

e. The fact of the diversity of sentiment was recognized by both the Synods at Dayton and Philadelphia, and yet the majority refused to allow the question to go to the Classes to decide between them, and to ascertain the mind of the church on the question.

That the adherents of Dr. Nevin and the unreformed Liturgy are a faction and do not represent the mind of the church, we also believe. Their persistent refusal to allow the consistories and congregations a veto on the use of the Liturgy, and on the doctrines and forms of worship there set forth, show this. Had they felt sure of a majority of the consistory and congregation, this refusal would not be on the records of the church courts.

f. How, then, were these accidental majorities achieved?

1. Because some were deceived by the pretenses that were set up for pure Reformed doctrine and usage. Some were made to believe that the opposition grew out of petty rivalries, etc. Some wanted peace at any price. Some went for the novelty of the thing.

2. Some believed that to oppose the professors was to oppose the church; and others were made to believe that it was sinful to oppose the ministers—the church. The church, to all interests

and purposes, is divided. Shall there be a separation? This is the question. Of course, those who hold to the *old* paths will never consent to this. They have refused to follow any tendency but that which led them home or kept them in closest adherence to the doctrines and usages of the fathers. They do not believe that many will in the day of trial be found ready to enlist under the banner of Mercersburg and Dr. Nevin, even though all "the rest of us" go with him. That tendency has worked itself out; it used, "*in a free way*," the liberty given, and has in its vanguard reached Rome. It was not trammelled in that direction, and, true to its germ, it tended to the Vatican. What church court dare to censure them? Synod said they were free to work out the results, and this is *all* that has been done. Stewart, T. W. Philips, Wolff, Ermentrout, Wagner and Forney have just done what their friends at the Philadelphia Synod told them they were free to do—they followed the tendency of Nevinism, as embodied in the order of worship, to its logical results, and no doubt are surprised how easy it was to get to Rome.

It is also out of all character for the Ritualistic majority that ruled the General Synods of 1866 and 1869 to make such unseemly ado about the fact that theology, Reformed theology, as taught in the Heidelberg Catechism, and the growth of the doctrine of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, is taught at Ursinus. Was it not permitted that side of the question also to work out its results in "*a free way*." If it was needful, and its friends did think it was, to have theology taught in the Eastern Synod to do this, then it was not right to put trammels in this matter in the direction of Ursinus alone. Remember, no restriction was put on the two tendencies by the Synod; and surely if one was free to work out its results to Romanism, ought not the other be allowed to draw those who yielded to its power, nearer to the ancient Reformed landmarks. Should not Dr. Apple, Gerhart, etc., be more manly than to take back what they conceded in order that they in *a free way* might work out the results of their theological experiments at Lancaster?

Those who voted against this unrestricted liberty—who asked that power to limit this free way of reaching results—who proposed that a negative should be placed in the consistory and in the congregation, do now claim the *right* to use all proper means, and employ all proper agencies to work out the results of Reformed



theology and bind the hearts of the church to the faith once delivered to the saints. These, too, while they repudiate and abhor the errors of Mercersburg and denounce the Romanism of the Eastern Liturgy, expect to remain in the old house their fathers built. If others will separate they may, but it will be found that when men divided the Reformed church, they were mistaken in believing that its members would go with them. They have enough of the *free way*, and now say with Mon. Pernessen, of the Reformed National Synod of France, "We are willing you should launch a *new* ship, provided you are not our pilots, and we are not constrained to be your passengers."

ULRIC.

---

MORE EVASIONS.

OUR Lancaster friends seem bent on evading the points pressed upon them. This may be annoying to some persons, and tempt them to say: Why urge the matter further? You can't keep them to the mark. They have been fairly convicted by their own words, and only prove by their replies a determination to deceive themselves or others. There is no use in arguing with men who resort to such evasions, &c.

We take a different view of the case. Their evasions are, in one sense, annoying, we admit. But, knowing by long experience with whom we have to deal, they are, in another respect, encouraging. They prove that the parties are conscious of being in a dilemma. Men will not evade evidence which they can squarely rebut. All attempts to do so plainly shows that they feel the weakness of their cause, and yet are unwilling frankly to confess it.

The fact appears to be, that the Lancaster Faculty is holding and teaching notions which are seen to be in direct conflict with evangelical theology, especially with the Reformed faith, and yet they fear to acknowledge it, and try to hold up those notions as sound and right.

Instead, therefore, of abandoning the case, it will be better to pursue it a little further. Lancaster must be constrained to explain and defend itself, or yield the point and fairly accept the consequences. It may do them good to be forced to see how far

they have erred from the faith. It certainly will do others good to be convinced of it. And, what is of still more account, it will help to save the church from being carried away by deceptive and pernicious errors.

Our December article—*What is It!*—was a plain setting forth of the Lancaster errors, by quotations fairly made from the writings of that school. Every candid reader could see the purport and the bearing of those quotations.\* They were given without comment, so as to let them tell their own story.

There was a frank, fair way of meeting the argument of those quotations. Dr. Apple, or some one else of the Faculty, should have taken them up, one by one, or all together as a whole (and we meant them to be taken together), and have shown that they did not and could not, in any true sense, mean and teach the

\* For the benefit of new subscribers we give the quotations again :

"Religion, to be real, must be in some way *community* of life with God; \* \* \* an "*inward conjunction in a real way.*"

"Christ *united Himself with manhood in its deepest substance, organically*, as its head, so that it may be saved generically in Him." The incarnation was "a union (of the Godhead in its substance, B.) with humanity, as an organic whole."

Again, the incarnation is declared to be "the incorporation of this higher element (that is, the substance of the Godhead in Christ, B.) into the actual onflowing life-stream of the world; \* \* \* a movement on the part of God in the bosom of humanity, taking hold on the depths of our human (Cosmic) existence in the most real historical way."

"Christianity is a *new order of life*, which is comprehended primarily in the person of Christ, and *which starts forth from Him as its original principle and root.*"

"The word incarnate is the root and origin of the entire new creation, no less fully than He is to be considered as being, before He became man, the producing cause of the old creation."

"The *organic* view of Christianity underlies the true idea of the church."

"The ultimate reason for the incarnation is to be sought \* \* \* *in the necessity of the divine self-revelation ad intra*, and in the relation of the second person of the Trinity ad extra, *to all that He created and made.*"

"The two creations (that is, the one described in Gen. i, and the creation described in the new creation in Jesus Christ under the Gospel, B.) are exhibited as being throughout *organically joined together* in His person."

"Neither is there any room for doubt in regard to the law which should govern the *coalescence* of the two orders of existence into one. \* \* \* There must be for this purpose a flowing into it (that is, into the lower natural life of man, B.) of spirit and life from a higher sphere (in an organic way, B.) Only in and by the powers of the heavenly world itself—only *through real conjunction* with those powers proceeding forth, as they do, from the Lord of life and glory—is it possible to *conceive rationally* of the glorification of the natural in man by means of the spiritual. The case requires and involves thus in the end an *actual coming together of nature and the supernatural, of the human and the divine*, to make the idea of humanity and the world complete."

"That life-breath which God breathed forth into Adam when he became a living soul, *cannot be regarded otherwise than as an emanation from the being of God.*"

"The life of regeneration is an *emanation, by the Holy Ghost, from Christ's divine-human life.*"

"The *life of the parent* is transmitted by ordinary generation to the child, and transmitted without any diminution of life on the side of the parent. \* \* *Life begets life.* \* \* Now, in this way we have an analogy in the natural order of what takes place in the glorified order."



errors charged upon their theology. He might then have stated explicitly what they did mean, and have demonstrated, if that could be done, that the theology of his school, though expressing itself in such peculiar ways, meant nothing contrary to or essentially differing from the faith of the church on the points involved.

Instead of doing this, however, he adopts an entirely different course. The quotations are allowed to be fair and correct, and there is no positive denial of the sense in which we, and many others (including Dr. Dorner), have taken them or similar utterances of the school. But it is impliedly, at least, denied that they teach the errors with which they are charged. Then Dr. Apple turns about and tries another way of getting out of the unpleasant predicament.

*Catechising.*

He assumes an offensive posture, and puts a number of questions to us, demanding our views in regard to the matters involved. He calls upon us to say, since we object to the doctrines taught by Lancaster, what *we* hold in reference to those doctrines. As we find fault with their way of expressing themselves, he insists upon our putting the thing our way, &c.

All right. We have not the least objection to being questioned. The catechetical method is an excellent one. We are entirely willing to take the bench, and let the Lancaster Faculty catechise us, fairly, as long and as sharply as they please. Let it be done, however, at the right time. Just now Lancaster is on the bench. They have put themselves there by their efforts to introduce into the church a theology believed to be seriously at variance with the faith of the church. When they are through, it may come to our turn, and we shall no way shrink from it.

*Why this?*

But why does Dr. Apple resort to this way of meeting our article? Plainly because he was unwilling to meet it squarely, and unable to defend his theology against the convicting evidence of our quotations. Every impartial reader of his reply must have felt this. That attempted reply amounts to nothing better than to an evasion from first to last.

Does the writer deny this? Then let him allow us to imitate his catechising example, and by a few plain, direct questions,

afford him another opportunity of doing what he needs to do in defence of his school, but forgot to do in his reply.

*Define your Position.*

The Lancaster school has long and often claimed to be occupying a wholly peculiar theological position, especially in regard to the fundamental doctrines of the incarnation, redemption, etc. Its leading advocates have in turn assailed every form of Evangelical Protestantism, including that of the Reformed church, and only excepting in part Puseyism and ultra-Lutheranism. It has called them successively, gnostically spiritualistic, rationalistic, materialistic, pietistic, and puritanic.

Now, we beg Dr. Apple, or some other member of that Faculty, to tell us in plain terms for once, where the theology of their school stands? Dorner, speaking for the modern evangelical theology of Germany says, in contradiction of Dr. Nevin's assertions, it is not with us. Dr. Hodge, speaking for the large Presbyterian branch of the Reformed church, says it is not with us. And every other branch of Evangelical Protestantism that has taken any notice at all of the Lancaster "duodecimo" theology, has declared it is not with us.

All disclaim kindredship with it, excepting Rome, Puseyism, and ultra-Lutheranism, as represented by Prof. Fritschel, of Iowa.

Will not the Faculty please say candidly whether in their inmost consciousness and conscience, they do not think their theology more Puseyite and ultra-Lutheran, than anything else?

*Explain Terms.*

Another peculiarity of the Lancaster school is found in the very frequent use of *terms* and phrases which are either entirely new for our Reformed theology, or which seem to be used in an entirely novel sense. There is good reason, therefore, for asking for a clear and unambiguous explanation of those terms. To this request the Faculty should gladly respond. We mention a few such terms so that a fair opportunity for explanation may be given.

"*Organic Redemption and Christianity*;" "*union* (of the God-head in the Word) *with humanity as an organic whole*;" the two creations "*organically joined together in His* (Christ's) *Person*." We know what *organic* means in its usual literal sense as applied to plants, animals and men. We know also what it means in a



topical or figurative sense, when applied to States, associations, laws, and systems of science or philosophy. But what does Lancaster theology mean by it when it uses it to express some relation assumed to exist between God, in Redemption or Christianity, and mankind? Does it not mean that as in the *literal* cases named above there are real *substantial* organs through which the life of such organized things is transmitted by seed of the same substance with the things themselves, so as to produce the same things in substance and kind; so in Redemption, in Christianity there are real, literal organs (however sublimated and refined they may be) through which the very substance of the life of God is made to pass over to mankind, so as to produce corresponding results?

If Lancaster should answer this question by quoting (as it has done) the passage, "partakers of the divine nature," then we beg the Faculty to explain whether it understands this Scripture phrase as teaching such a transfer or conveyance of the very substance of God in Christ over into the human nature of every believer?

And, further: when Lancaster says that the Incarnation of the Son was affected by such an "organic conjunction" of the divine nature with human nature as an organic whole—it does not mean that the two natures were so joined together as to form but one nature? Or if not this, will the Faculty please say how two natures can be organically fused and yet kept really distinct?

"*Emanation from the being of God;*" and "*emanation (in regeneration) by the Holy Ghost from Christ's divine-human life.*" Does not Lancaster mean, by the former of these expressions, to teach and say, that the substance of man's life *flowed* by the will of God from the substance of God's being or life; or, in other words, that man's soul or spirit is an offshoot, a substantial emanation from God's? And if this is not what is meant, what does the statement mean? By the other expression or statement, does not Lancaster mean, that in the sacrament of Baptism, some real germinal substance passes over, through the sacrament, as a channel to the person baptized, and that this germinal substance is really and literally a part of the very substance of what it calls the theanthropic nature of Christ?

Not to lay too heavy a burden on our friend at once, these inquiries may suffice for the present. They can readily appreciate

the importance, for their own sakes, as well as others, of giving them fair consideration, and unequivocal answers. The questions indicate our understanding of their theory. We believe we have not misunderstood it. But we are willing and anxious to afford our friends the fullest opportunity of explaining their views, and proving that they are not holding or teaching any sort of pantheism.

Should it not accord with their sense of dignity to pay any formal attention to our plain, straightforward inquiries, we shall cheerfully accept a valid explanation in their own way. Only our friends must not delude themselves with the thought that they can best vindicate their errors by contemptuous silence. Such silence will be fully and fairly understood as a confession of their inability to defend their cause.

---

## Ursinus College Repertory.

---

THE pages of this department are again devoted mainly to addresses delivered at the recent anniversary of the "*Schaff Literary Society*." It affords us great pleasure to be able to furnish these addresses of our young men of the two societies, and it is gratifying to know that our readers are interested in their publication. As in the case of the addresses of the Zwinglian Society, which appeared in the *Monthly* soon after their delivery, those now published will be found to possess great merit and reflect honor upon Ursinus College. Our friends, we feel sure, will share the honest pride we take in these practical illustrations of the successful progress of the College.

By an oversight which we regret, the oration published in the January number, appeared without a prefatory statement of its character, or of the name of the author, Mr. *Leighton G. Kremer*, of Lebanon. The former of the two given below, is by Mr. *J. G. Neff*, of Kutztown, Pa., and the latter by Mr. *M. Peters*, of Saegersville, Pa.



## THE UNITED STATES IN HISTORY.

By a careful research into the physical universe, we perceive harmony, order, and purpose pervading the whole. Design, like golden threads, runs through the whole organic world, vegetable and animal, and unites both to inorganic nature according to place and circumstances. The zöologist sees in the innumerable forms of animal life, but four "typical forms" which embrace the whole animal kingdom. The scientist arranges the whole vegetable world into regular classes, orders, genera, and species. To the uneducated, the heavens present a scene of disorder and confusion. But to Newton's eye all was order and harmony. All those glittering orbs had their appointed places and fixed orbits. Moreover, there is not an object, phenomenon, or law in nature, which does not subserve a specific purpose in the order and existence of the whole. Considerations of this kind lead us to the illation that there must be such order and purpose in the moral world which is incomparably above mere physical nature. And, furthermore, that there is not a phenomenon in history which does not act an essential part in the great historical scheme of the world.

The United States, in geographical extension equal to "Old Imperial Rome," in fertility of soil unsurpassed, the home of the thousands of all the different nationalities that are immigrating annually, must have some momentous part to perform in the history of the world, and a part which can be acted by no other nation. It is difficult for us to conceive of the future greatness of America, except so far as we are enabled from the uniformity of the law of history. Who ever dreamed of our present civilization and political power at the time when Columbus, a fanatic, a dreamer and an enthusiast, was imploring aid for that important discovery. The very lightning that illuminated the watery waste around his ship, scudding the deep; the very thunder that terrified his crew, was turned into a means, on the very soil upon which we now stand, of conveying thought all around the world in a moment of time. We are ready to give a reply to the inspired exclamation of Job, "Canst thou send lightning that they may go and say unto thee, here we are!" There seem to be no impossibilities in the way of a clear-minded, pure-hearted, energetic race.

Civilization moves with the course of the sun. "Time's noblest

offspring is the last." Before the United States had risen into historical importance, Asia and Europe successively formed the arena of the world's intellectual life. But civilization, which had its origin or source in the east, gradually enlarged in extension and depths in its geographical flow westward, until it reached the new world, admirably fitted to receive its entire stream; impure and defiled at first, its errors and superstitions crystallized and precipitated upon the old soil, and now it is permitted us to enjoy the bright sun of liberty and independence, and the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ, our guide-star and hope. These are the fruits, not of our own labors alone, but of the accumulated labors of all the past from the beginning of history. We need not undergo the painful process of seeking for the truth, which the by-gone ages have endured. We need not be groping in the dark, like the Greeks and Romans, for the great moral truths which pertain to the eternal destiny of the world. But all these truths have been handed down to us as our social, intellectual and moral inheritance. We receive civilization from the hands of our ancestors all ready-made, as the basis of further improvement. Moreover, the political experience and discipline of the past, as marked out to us in history, was requisite in order to the Constitution of the United States. In it we perceive, as in a picture, the governmental powers of the entire past. The President symbolizes monarchy, characteristic of the very infancy of the race. The representatives form the aristocratic element. That each naturalized citizen is permitted a voice, the democratic element. Here we have the three great types of government harmonized into one.

Humanity, in its march through the ages, is analogous to the stages of man's individual existence. It has spent its infancy in the east, under the iron arm of authority and power, where it has learned obedience and submission. It has attained its manhood in Europe, where it has become conscious of its own internal dignity and power, and of the need of individual and social emancipation for the full development of those powers. Nature points to America as the historical theatre of its last act. Liberty, civil and religious, is the medium of manhood.

Each nation has its ruling sentiment, or an underlying principle which shapes its character. Hence, we have the different nationalities. Amongst the Greeks this ruling sentiment was "love of



glory." Amongst the Romans, it was desire of power, and universal sway or dominion. Amongst the Americans it is *love of liberty*.

This underlying principle, which is the fruit of the struggling ages, approved of by reason, and matured under the rays of Divine revelation, urged our Pilgrim fathers to leave the home of their ancestors to settle in the wilds of America, and there to lay the foundation of a new nationality, which has already become the pride of the world and one of the noblest ornaments of history. Each nation, furthermore, has its own mode of thought or thinking. The Germanic mind is speculative and contemplative. The English mind has a practical tendency. The French mind has its exponent in the politeness and affability of the French people. The American mind is characteristic of none of these foreign types of thought, exclusively. On the other hand, it embraces and harmonizes the individualities of all the leading nations on earth. We are, therefore, justified in saying, that one of the leading characteristics of the American nation is a harmonious and well-balanced mind. Experience proves that an intermingling of the races is essential to all progress. China, which has cut itself off from the rest of the world by means of its gigantic wall, has been up to our time the symbol of stability and stagnation. Rome was formed of and held in its embrace the greater part of the known world; and there has never been a nation in all the past that has made a deeper and more lasting impression on the page of history. England is formed of the Celts, the Anglo-Saxons, the Danes and the Normans. Shakespeare and Milton, as the representatives and intellectual princes of that nation, have built themselves living monuments in the wonder and admiration of the world. The United States is the rendezvous of the world. A person by traveling from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in reality, makes a political tour all around the globe. She receives into her "stomach" the English, the German, the French; soon they are digested and converted into American blood (nationalized). Again, with this external gathering of political atoms, there is inseparably and indissolubly connected an immigration of thought and a centralization or focalizing of the world's intellectual life.

Practically speaking, what is the influence and work of our country? There is not a nation on earth upon which the world's

eye rests more steadfastly than on the United States. We have entered on an experiment which never had its parallel in the history of the world. The hope of all liberty is centered in us and our influence, and the wise men of the world are watching the course of our Western Star with joyous and prayerful emotions. The Chinese are arriving in crowds on our Western coast, with compressed feet and cramped minds. They return to their homes freed from their physical and intellectual shackles, to break veteran customs and habits of their own nation, and to infuse into its very heart the vitalizing principles of the United States. Again, there is an unevangelized world behind us—the very place where the Apostles first trumpeted the glad tidings of salvation. May it not be the purpose of Providence to raise a nation which shall illuminate the dark places of the earth? Our country is admirably located to cast its influence abroad with the greatest facility.

History develops what is in man. Its office is to mark out the progress of mankind in civilization—in the arts, sciences, literature, political freedom and religious truth. The admirable attainments made in these different spheres are pointed out to us in our American histories. It but remains for me to add, that our present field of thought is mainly science and religion. It is the duty of the American people earnestly to grasp the advantages they enjoy, to place new stones upon the wall of science, and draw nearer unto the true God. In order to do this, we enjoy the experience and accumulated researches of our predecessors. Newton taught us to apply the line and measure to the glittering orbs anchored in the skies. Faraday, Bacon, Locke, taught us to analyze the universe of matter and mind. We are encouraged in these researches because nature, upon which science is founded, is the work of God. Tennyson imbedded his thoughts and gave us a transcript of his mind in his poems. God externalized *His* thoughts, and gave *us* a transcript of His mind in nature. The deeper and broader our views of nature, the more perfect our knowledge of its author. All science rightly (by the light of revelation) studied, leads to God. They are but so many roads leading to the same centre. Here *history* reaches its goal—the return of the *mind* and *heart* to God.

J. G. N.

---

STEEP your Sermons in your heart before you preach them.



## EULOGY—MILTON.

THE mind of man can be expanded to a very high degree. This, however, is not a sudden act. The noblest faculty with which our Creator has endowed us, does not, in its normal condition, decline with the increase of years, but its energies are increased proportionately. Use does not impair its power. The process of development, which continues without intermission through the years of a lifetime, is one of the most elevating in its results. It raises man into a higher sphere, where his thoughts and inclinations are bent to contemplate and admire objects of purity, and such as are conformable in every respect to the character of a mind thus elevated. In the regions of the ideal world the mental cravings are satisfied, to some extent, and the emotions that follow are pleasurable. The transient scenes of the ever busy world are distracting, but the aspirations of man must rise higher than these, and must be steady in their course. The glorious and triumphant march of intellect can be noticed in the works of science, art and literature, which mark the progress of the ages. Yet these lights of the world, men of genius, are "few and far between." We have the highest admiration for men who have attained an enviable position in the world of letters. Who can estimate the pleasure realized from reading the works of a Shakespeare, or a Milton? Who could claim great literary eminence without being conversant with the great master minds of Germany? It is by studying the works of such men that we attain the highest intellectual development. Our thoughts and actions, the exponents of our characters, depend entirely upon the nature of our training, moral, as well as intellectual. Our intellectual progress is slow and steady; step by step, higher and higher, we ascend in the domains of science and literature. But we are certain of the most cheering satisfaction arising from our efforts if we relax them only for rest. Therefore, none should despair, for "there is no royal road to learning." It is true that some have more appropriate natural gifts than others, but there is no excuse for any one to bury the talent entrusted to him. There are some whose brilliancy of intellect far surpasses that of others, even as the splendor of the sun exceeds that of the constellations of the firmament. But every person has a work suited to his abilities, and of such a character that he will reap abundant success if he meet the requi-

site demands. Poetry is the language of the heart. The purest and sweetest accord is produced by the rhythmic measures of the poet. It soothes the passions and elevates the affections. It is with pleasure that we point to Milton as the highest representative of this art. His figure stands prëminent as embodying the highest degree of culture. Many centuries before him, a country far famed for its relics of literature, and for the vast impetus it gives to intellectual activity, had the proud honor of contesting the birthplace of the great epic poet. Homer was the poet of a rude age; an age in which a blind and superstitious people paid homage to their national deities. It was, however, an age of great philosophers sculptors, and engravers. The student of classical literature finds the most profuse imagery in the Homeric poems. The simple and vivid expressions, characteristic of the people, adorn their pages. The poems he wrote have outlived the centuries gone by, and their thoughts are still as fresh as when they were first sung to the assembled multitude by the Ionian bard. Although he was blind, his imagination was sparkling. The picture in his mind was more vivid than any living scene could exhibit. It is from this source of ancient Grecian lore, that Milton received a great deal of his inspiration, and by the continual sippings of which his whole being was saturated. Milton lived in a time when Christianity diffused its blessed influence. In his youth he was set apart for the study of polite literature, which he grasped with such avidity that he hardly ever retired before twelve at night. At an early age he wrote poetry, not only in his native tongue, but also in Latin, with classic elegance. He enjoyed the benefits of a thorough classical course; and while at the university one of the noblest poems, his "Hymn to the Nativity," was written. But whilst his genius was of the highest order, and whilst it is true that "the poet is born, not made," we must not imagine that he was exempt from the onerous training for his work. The object of his great poem is clearly presented in the opening of the first book.

"Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit  
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste  
Brought death into the world and all our woe,  
With loss of Eden, till one greater man  
Restore us and regain the blissful seat."

The fall of man from a state of purity and innocence to that



of abject misery, is portrayed in this poem. The Messiah is the hero who triumphs over Satan, sin, death ; and the race of man, whose ruin Satan had contemplated, is restored to greater happiness than that from which it fell. The character of Satan is described in such terms that will strike the reader with terror. We have a picture of the infernal world with all its horror, as well as of the regions of universal bliss and happiness. The survey of the whole creation by the Almighty, and the scene that follows, is beautiful.

“ No sooner had th’ Almighty ceas’d, but all  
The multitude of angels with a shout,  
Loud as from numbers without number, sweet  
As from blest voices, uttering joy ; heaven rung  
With jubilee, and loud hosannas fill’d  
Th’ eternal regions.”

Paradise, the seat of action, is adorned with such a redundancy of ornaments that makes it strikingly beautiful. Trees of all kinds flourished in it, and in the midst of them all stood the tree of life. A large river flowing on orient pearl and sands of gold traversed it and watered each plant. Here was a quiet scene of nature of varied view. The strains of the noblest songsters must have been impressive as they warbled their sweet notes in the shady groves. A happier and dearer abode than this, as here depicted, cannot be surpassed anywhere. It was a heaven on earth. The evening worship of our first parents in the great temple of nature, is full of that adoration and reverence to which we are led when contemplating the manifold works of the Creator. What an immense amount of knowledge is comprised in that volume, and how great must be the influence accruing from it if read with deep earnestness of thought ! How deep the devotion of our innermost feelings when we see the beneficence of God in redeeming the race of man, shining forth throughout the entire poem, and his Almighty power engraved on the minutest part of his creation. May it never be said of this poem, that it is more admired than read ; but may millions of hearts continue to beat in unison with the sentiment uttered therein. Who that meditates over the strains of Milton, does not feel that he drank deep at “Siloa’s brook that flowed fast by the oracle of God.” He survived his health, his sight, the comforts of his home, and the prosperity of his party. He was placed in the midst of a licen-

tious court and held up to the scorn of an inconstant people. His great and majestic mind overcame every calamity. He was chaste and serene amidst all trial and difficulties, and his angelic countenance was but the mirror of those pure and elevated thoughts of his mind and heart. His "Paradise Lost" is immortal, and although the pecuniary advantage was but trifling to him, yet it won for him "golden" opinions from the best writers of the day. Milton lived in an era of great political conflicts; conflicts between liberty and despotism. The great principles established then are existing now, and will continue to do so as long as sweet liberty's tree shall flourish; they have found their way to the depths of American forests, and have kindled an unquenchable fire in the hearts of the oppressed. We are not disposed to idolize a great man, whether living or dead; but no encomiums can be too great for a person who has been "tried in the furnace of affliction and found true; who has been weighed in the balance and not found wanting. He labored for the public good, and looked with lofty disdain on every temptation and danger. He bore a deadly hatred against bigots and tyrants. In this we may most worthily follow his example. He was blind, but he could hear the angelic harmony of that celestial night when the heavenly choir sang, "Glory to God in the highest, Peace on earth and good will toward men." Beneath the mouldering heap his ashes are silently laid, but he occupies his niche of fame besides Shaksepeare and the great poets of intiquity; his faults and mistakes, and his controversial writings, are buried in a merciful oblivion, while the good he did lives after him.

M. P.

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

THE *Winter Term* opened January 5th, 1874. With very few exceptions all the old students returned, and there was a considerable accession of new students for this season of the year. The list for the term reaches the encouraging number of nearly ninety. All appear to be glad to be back again at their work, and are diligently prosecuting their studies. Everything indicates progressive and solid prosperity.



AN ERROR CORRECTED.—In a small exchange received from Lancaster, *Ursinus College* is classed among several others which are represented as auxiliaries and adjuncts to Franklin and Marshall in Lancaster. This is a very grave mistake. Ursinus College claims to stand on its own foundation, and to work independently of any other institution for the cause to which it is consecrated. Without making any lofty pretensions, it acknowledges no subordinate auxiliary relation to any self-constituted *central* school. It owes fealty to no one but the Lord and the church. And its friends have reason to rejoice that both are greatly favoring its efforts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.—For the many kind and liberal remembrances of friends who have recently contributed to our Educational (and Beneficiary) cause, we are sincerely thankful. They greatly encourage us in our work, and cheer those who are thus enabled to prepare themselves for the duties of the ministry. Further assistance in this way is earnestly solicited.

Rev. E. J. Fogel.....	\$50 00
Rev. F. F. Bahner, Milton.....	75 00
Rev. Dr. F. W. Kremer, Lebanon.....	50 00
Rev. A. Wanner, Mt. Zion.....	10 00
Rev. F. S. Lindaman, Blain.....	20 00
A friend, per Rev. G. Wolff.....	6 00
Rev. A. B. Shenkel, Millersville.....	29 25
Abraham Wagner, near Reading.....	20 00
Rev. R. S. Apple, Hamburg.....	27 75
Rev. George Wolff.....	25 00
Rev. H. A. Keyser, (Nov. 5th, 1873).....	50 00

---

## EDITORS' DESK.

*Double thanks* to the friends who have cheered us in our work by procuring *new subscribers*, and *promptly paying up for the year*. Both are needful in sustaining such periodicals. Judging from frequent appeals in our exchange papers, our enterprise has no more reason to complain than others, and, considering our inability to employ a business agent, perhaps less reason. Sincere thanks, therefore, we repeat to the many friends who have given substantial

proof of their appreciation of the service rendered by the *Reformed Church Monthly* to the cause of evangelical Christianity in our church.

Thanks, also, to the many brethren and friends who, in remitting money, have added warm and inspiring words of hearty approval and encouragement. We are half tempted to give extracts from such letters, written by old ministers and by younger ones, by *elders* of the church, who have given proof of their love to her true faith and character by years of service, and by liberal donations of money, now considered worse than lost, and by laymen equally devoted to her interests. But to do so might savor of vanity. We, therefore, let our sincere thanks suffice until this general acknowledgment of the favor.

Let the encouraging example thus set be imitated by others. Still wider coöperation is needed, and, we trust, will be given by all in sympathy with our endeavors.

---

*Beware of deceptive pleas for Peace.*—It is, indeed, something to be ardently desired and prayed for. It is something to secure which everything should be done that can be done, without sacrificing principles and truth. But it is better even to *contend* for the faith than to abandon it to error.

And yet some of the followers (at a distance) of the Lancaster-Mercersburg party, are trying to get up among the people a feeling for peace—a desire to make the opposition to Lancaster errors unpopular, on the ground that such opposition is keeping the church in constant agitation and interfering with our proper work.

Let those to whom the true life and faith of the church are dear, beware of such pleas. They are deceptive. They are made, also, at a time when they come in very awkwardly.

Lancaster has been finding that it cannot carry its doctrines and measures *just now*. The church has been aroused to a sense of the wrong of those measures and the error of those doctrines. Some of the friends of Lancaster see that their cause is in peril; that the Lancaster Faculty has gone too far, *for the present*, and is unable to defend itself; that it is in a bad predicament. *Now* comes the cry for peace, for dropping the controversy, &c.

The case is a very plain one. And yet some may be deluded by the plausible way in which the plea for peace is made. The disturbers of our peace are not those who are striving to maintain and defend the faith and principles of the church—to keep the church from being changed in her very life and doctrines—but those are the real disturbers who have for years been agitating the church with their attempts materially to alter her true faith and religious character.

Furthermore, the matters in controversy are not trifles—not things of secondary importance, about which difference of opinion might well be tolerated. Recent apostasies to Popery, and other defections, have clearly shown that the controversy virtually involves the question: Shall we continue Evangelical Reformed, or shall we become more or less Roman Catholics? The church must decide; and that it may do so, it must be informed.



*An Awkward Retreat.*—Our Lancaster friends have found it impossible to defend their development claims against the proofs that their theology is not a legitimate development or carrying out of Reformed doctrines, but a surrender and betrayal of those doctrines, mainly, into the hands of Romanists and old Lutherans. They are out of all patience with being held so strictly to the point. Unable to do any better, and unwilling to confess their failure to maintain their pretensions, they *decline any further discussion of the subject*. Somewhat to cover the real character of this retreat, an unwarranted reason is given for it. Our January article, "Evading Issues," is represented as *passionate* and *angry*. This was news to us. Instead of having written it in anger, we were really in the best humor when it was penned, though as really in earnest. That our Lancaster friend may have been somewhat ruffled in reading it, is quite possible. But he should not have ascribed his own excitement to the article.

One more word. After this it is to be hoped that Lancaster will no more deceive itself, or others, by mistaking and misrepresenting radical departures from the faith, and bold opposition to it, for historical development. It is to be hoped, also, that its true character in this respect will now be fairly understood and admitted. No more sailing under false colors.

*Lancaster logic* is as faulty and absurd as some of its theology. Here is a sample of it:

The theology of that school has been proven, by its own language, to teach many serious errors, and, among the rest, a very hurtful form of pantheism. In proof of this, its frequent use of such phrases and terms as "organic conjunction" of the Godhead with human nature as a whole; "an inward conjunction in a real way;" "the incorporation" of the substance of the Godhead in Christ "into the actual outflowing life-stream of the world;" "the coalescence of the two orders of existence," the divine and the human, "*into one*;" "the actual coming together," in this way, "of the human and the divine;" "man is an emanation from the being of God," &c.

Now, in reply to this overwhelming proof, the Faculty at Lancaster, unable to defend itself, turns around upon us, and charges that in a book of ours *we* use terms and expressions which amount to the same thing. The book referred to was written in **1858**, more than *fifteen years* ago, a fact which our honorable friend forgot to state. This fact we wish to emphasize, because it serves to show that even then, with all our desire to avoid breaking with our Mercersburg brethren, and all the influence which a misplaced personal confidence and regard had upon our mind and heart, we kept clear of their errors.

Why does the Faculty refer to this book, and so largely quote from it? Plainly, for one of two reasons, or for both. Either it wishes to make the impression that the book, as quoted, teaches the errors we have exposed and denounced as being pantheistic, or it wishes to get us and others away from looking at its errors to a defense of its attack on us. It wishes to get up a diversion, under which it may escape from its unpleasant predicament. Is this another specimen of Lancaster Jesuitry in logic?

Whatever it is, there is no difficulty in meeting the attack and repelling it.

1. We deny that the quotations made from the book referred to, contain any such doctrine as is taught by the terms and phrases cited from the writings of the Lancaster school. Any one can see this by comparing the two. And however poor an opinion we may have of the Faculty's discernment, we can hardly bring ourselves to think that Dr. T. G. Apple did not see this fact. He ought to know that the doctrine of a "real and living union with Christ" is a very different thing from teaching an "organic conjunction of the Godhead with man," and teaching that regeneration is effected by "an emanation from the life-substance of God," transmitted through baptism. *We believe he does know it.*

2. Even if in 1858-9 we had taught such an abominable error, or even had advocated "the cursed idolatry of the mass" (as our Catechism justly calls it)—is that any reason why we should be held to the error now? or is that any excuse for Lancaster teaching it?

Paul was once a fanatical Pharisee. Did that bind him hand and foot, body and soul, always to remain a Pharisee? All men by nature are children of the devil. Does that oblige them forever to continue such?

This may be Lancaster logic. But, happily, it is not the logic of good common sense, or of better grace.

3. But the artifice of the Faculty is of no avail. At the right time, if needful, we can show that the very book of 1858-9 referred to, was aimed both against the baptistic and baptismal regeneration errors. Just now, however, is not the time for that. At present we have to do with Lancaster pantheism and its other false doctrines; and we shall hold the Faculty to a better vindication of itself than it has yet given, or to a confession of the charge brought against it.

Neither Dr. A., nor any of his confederates, shall tempt us away from exposing the bad foundation of their theory, by setting fire to any "hay and stubble" we may have piled up on the old and true foundation. If we ever did gather such miserable stuff from the Mercersburg-Lancaster field, and try to build a house of it, it ought to burn down; and we will most cheerfully "let it go" to ashes, only glad to see it consumed so soon. No attempt to put out the flames shall divert us from the far more important work of exposing the stubble-house on a sandy foundation, into which Lancaster is striving to pervert Reformed Christianity, and to persuade it to take refuge.

---

*Corrections.*—By a printing mistake, the *terms* for clubs of six are given, on the title-page of the January and some preceding numbers, as \$1.50. This should be \$10.50, as in the advertisement on the second page of cover.

In the *contents* for January number, on cover, the first article is announced as *The Enduring World*—read *Word*. A number of other typographical errors have been discovered, but in most cases the reader would easily detect and correct them. In December, however, a quotation in the article, *What is It?* was accredited to *Dr. Gans*, instead of *Gass*—a rather ludicrous mistake.



## BOOK NOTICES.

*From Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway, New York, Exodus, &c.,* By B. F. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter.

This volume includes all of "*The Speaker's Commentary*," relating to the Book of Exodus. It is issued in this form for the convenience of Sunday-schools studying the International Series, and will be found a most valuable aid in the study of this portion of the Bible. The notes, maps, and special dissertations, embody the results of the most recent researches and investigations, and impart a value to the work not possessed by any similar one now before the public.

*The Bibliotheca Sacra*.—This standard theological quarterly enters upon its thirty-first volume with the January number, which presents articles on the following topics: *Theology, a Possible Science*, by Dr. Thomas Hill, ex-president of Harvard University; *Galilee, in the Time of Christ* by Rev. Serah Merrill; *Natural Realism*, by Rev. J. Macbride Sterrett; *Book Rarities at Washington*, by Frederic Vinton; *The Hebrew Tense*, by Rev. Dr. A. B. Rich; *The Natural Basis of our Spiritual Language*, by Dr. W. M. Thomson, of the Syrian Mission; *Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament*, by Rev. G. H. Whittemore; *Letters from Halle, Leipzig and Heidelberg, Notices of New Publications*. The high character of this able quarterly is well sustained by this number, and its value to the theologians is as great as ever. W. F. Draper, Andover, Mass. \$4 a year.

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

OUR OWN CHURCH—*Changes in the Ministry*.—Rev. W. D. C. Rodrock to Stone church, Northampton county, Pa.

Rev. F. P. Hartmetz to Sharon, Mercer county, Pa.

Rev. E. H. Otting to Warren, Trumbull county, Ohio.

Rev. H. Hanhart to 372, Central Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rev. F. W. Steffens to Galveston, Texas.

ADDITIONS TO CHURCHES.—Kittanning Mission, Rev. D. S. Diffenbacher, pastor, 43 were added. South Bethlehem, Pa., 32 were added. Southwest, Ind., Rev. J. B. Ruhl, pastor, 13 were added. Tartelton charge, Ohio, Rev. J. S. Gough, pastor, 5 were added. Millersburg, Ind., 3 were added. Farmersville, Ohio, Rev. L. Rike, pastor, 5 were added. Duncannon, Pa., Rev. H. Wisler, pastor, 12 were added. St. Jacob's church, Lisbon, Ohio, 9 were added. Newmantown, Pa., Rev. T. C. Leinbach, pastor, 18 were added. South Bethlehem, Rev. N. Z. Snyder, pastor, 26 were added. St.

Mark's congregation, New Hamburg, 6 were added. Mt. Union congregation, during the present pastorate of six months, 65 were added.

INSTALLATIONS.—Rev. Dr. G. W. Mudder was installed on New Year's day, pastor of St. James' congregation, by a committee of the Allegheny Classis.

Rev. J. H. Sykes has been installed pastor of the Woodcock Valley charge.

CHURCH NEWS.—*During Christmas week* the Sunday-schools of Lebanon, Myerstown, Philadelphia, Trappe, Brownbacks, Slatington, Millersville, and many other congregations had appropriate and highly interesting celebrations. Such celebrations, rightly managed, may be made not only pleasant and cheering, but instructive and profitable. It is evident, however, that constant care is needful to keep them from running out and down into seasons of mere fun and frolic—Popish ceremonies under Protestant patronage. A Christmas festival should at least be Christian, whether in the family or in the Sunday-school; and everything calculated to pervert the Christian element, or to crowd it out by the introduction of things utterly foreign to the great and blessed fact and truths commemorated, should be excluded. In this view, the plan adopted in the Lebanon church (Dr. Kremer's) of suitable recitations by the school, is to be commended.

*Reformed Church at Slatington, Pa.*, Rev. L. K. Derr, pastor. It was our privilege to assist brother Derr at a communion on Sunday, January 25th. The visit afforded a good opportunity of seeing the great success attending his labors in Slatington. The congregation in Slatington was organized only about four years ago, chiefly through the zeal of Rev. Dr. Helfrich. Brother Derr became the first pastor of the charge. A new church edifice has been erected (a union house, Reformed and Lutheran) which is nearly paid for, and the number of communicants has nearly doubled, being now about 175. This rapid growth is the more remarkable, as the parent church, of which that in Slatington is an offshoot, is situated within about one mile of the outer limits of the town. During both the services, morning German, and evening English, the house was quite filled, although the weather was intensely cold, and the roads were immensely rough, so as to keep away many members from the country. In the afternoon we attended the Sabbath school, and were surprised and delighted to find so large a school, thirty-three classes, averaging some eight members each, and conducted with so much spirit and excellent order. The Slatington congregation adheres with firm and intelligent love and zeal to the old faith and principles of the church, and could not be easily persuaded to barter them for any specious novelties.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.—*A remarkable Bible class.* About three years ago R. F. Kelker, esq., of Harrisburg, Pa., took charge, by special request, of the Bible class of the First Reformed church in that city. At the time the class numbered less than twenty young ladies and gentlemen. Under the charge of the new teacher it grew so rapidly that it became necessary to remove from the Sunday-school room to the church. In a little more than one year the number of members had increased to 128, and from the *Souvenir of the class* for 1873,



a beautifully gotten up and exceedingly interesting pamphlet, we learn that during the past year the whole number in attendance was 179, viz: Eighty-four ladies and ninety-five gentlemen. What a power for good is the opportunity thus afforded. And how gratifying to know, that it is in the hands of so evangelical, earnest and zealous an Elder of the church. May the rich blessing of the Lord continue to rest upon the work, cheering the heart of this faithful laborer, and crowning the efforts put forth with still more abundant success.

*The Christian Intelligencer* contributes the following to the Bishop Cummins controversy:

*Is Bishop Cummins Guilty of Schism?*

Two very different sorts of offences are covered by the one name of "schism." The first offense is real, and gets its name of "schism" from Scripture, where, however, it is mentioned at most but three times. Twice St. Paul charges the Corinthians with schisms ("divisions," according to our version), 1 Cor. 1: 10; 11: 18; and once the word "schism" is retained by our translators to describe an imaginary feud among the members of a human body (1 Cor. 12, 25). The figurative relation of this last passage to the "body of Christ" gives the word the same meaning here as in the two verses above named. New Testament schism, then, was nothing else than an uncharitable party spirit, though nourished within the same visible organization or "body." Of course if such party spirit should go on and rend the organized church, the division of feeling—the true "schism"—would underlie and qualify the outward rending. But this outward division, of itself, and entirely apart from that wicked motive, would be a schism of another sort. It would be, that is, a formal partition of the church, as a society organized and administered under a given set of human rules and officers.

Now, it is to this last named and formal division of the church, as an organized body, that ecclesiastical law has come to apply the New Testament word. And the application is entirely just in all those cases in which the formal division of the organized church is the direct product and sign of a spirit of strife.

But the question now arises, whether external divisions in a church may not sometimes be even demanded on grounds of prudence and of loyalty to Christ; so that such divisions shall sustain no relation whatever to the uncharitable opposition of parties—the only schism known to the New Testament?

At this question two roads meet, and opinions divide. "High-churchmen of every sort, from the Pope down, insist that church organization and transmitted grace are so sacred that nothing but party spirit could dream of external separation from "the church." And if we admit their theory, they are right in their conclusion. A well arm is not to be cut off, even from a sickly trunk; for there is only one heart, and that the arm could not take with it.

But others say: It is not a lineal succession of church officers, nor any human transmission of divine grace, that makes the church. The Catholic visible church consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion. They further insist that, as things now are in the world, the inte-

rests of the true religion require some diversities in the administration of this great body of believers; so that those men who conscientiously and with charity arrange for a separate administration of church ordinances and authority within the general law of Christ, though they may sometimes be chargeable with mistakes or even with folly, are not chargeable with schism, except in that factitious ecclesiastical sense that lacks all endorsement from the words or spirit of the New Testament.

For our part, we consider this latter position to be unassailable. When the members of a church leave it only for the conscientious purpose of securing another ecclesiastical organization, which, equally with the first, shall be within the church universal, and which, by its homogeneity and its sounder doctrine or more evangelical spirit, shall save some important interest of religion from apparent peril; when such men effect their departure with as little violence as the case admits, and with perfect charity toward those whom they leave behind, they are no more to be charged with schism than with quarrelsome and bitterness, which are the unfailing accompaniment of real schism.

In a word, truly Protestant Christians, in speaking of schism and schismatics, will do well to pay great deference to the inspired definition and rebuke of schism, and to stop there. The man-made, high-church notion of a schism, committed *ipso facto* in separating without consent, is as absurd among Protestant denominations as an awe of *jure divino* kingship would be among republicans. Our churches have no use nor place for such a figment. By its own definition it contemplates separation from "the church;" and "the church" with us is the whole church, so that separation from that is a forsaking of the profession of the true religion. Bishop Cummins certainly has not reached that pass.

Those moderate Episcopalians, then, and others who talk about him as a schismatic, should consider where they are putting Luther and Calvin, and Robinson and Wesley.

The grotesqueness of this new separation lies in the fact that it is bent both on leaving what exclusives call "the church," and on taking it along. Which ever of these inconsistent things it may do at last, it is absurd for any Protestant to call it a schism.

In a certain Scotch parish, the grave-digger was also an officer of the parish. Suspicion had for some time been entertained that he had been in the habit of abstracting some of the alms from the alm-box. The elders told the minister something must really be done. The minister said, "Leave him to me, and I'll see what can be done." The following Sunday, after the forenoon service, the minister was taking off his gown and band, and being alone in the vestry with the unsuspected man, thought the opportunity too good to be lost; so he said, "Andrew, have you heard of the money that is missing from the box?" "Oh, ay," said Andrew, "I was hearing something about it." "Andrew," continued the other very gravely, "the matter lies between you and me. We are the only two who have access to the box. Either you or I must be the thief." "Deed, sir," rejoined the imperturbable Andrew, "It's just as you say, we're the only two that has access to the box, and I think the best way'll be for you



to pay the tae half and I pay the tither and say nae mair aboot it.—*Churchman*.

The religious faculty is as old as history. In the barbarism of the past, this faculty, like all others, is the slave of ignorance. The religion of Zoroaster is, perhaps, the oldest of which we have any knowledge. Like the leaf of the modest fern, that has left its impress upon the coal measures, so much of the good, and pure, and true that Zoroaster taught his followers, made its impress upon succeeding ages. "I invoke and worship benevolence, purity, and a worthy life," said a Persian prayer. "The wise man," said Buddha, "cherishes reflection as his jewel." "Without meditation there is no knowledge." Socrates, Plato, Confucius, and many others, who lived long before the Christian era, uttered many religious truths, which are living principles to-day. The world is better for their having lived in it.

There is a set of people (says Chalmers) whom I cannot bear—the pinks of fashionable propriety—whose every word is precise, and whose every movement is unexceptionable; but who, though versed in all the categories of polite behavior, have not a particle of soul or cordiality about them. There may be elegance in every gesture, not a smile out of place; but what I want is the heart and gaiety of social intercourse—the frankness that spreads ease and animation around it—the eye that speaks affability to all, that chases timidity from every bosom, and tells every man in the company to be confident and happy.

*Lunacy and Thinking.*—There is no nation where madness is so rare as in Turkey, where the people of all others, think the least. In France, Germany and England—countries distinguished for intellectual activity—the number of suicides is greater than in any other countries.—*Medical Times and Gazette*.

"*Self-possession*, based upon a sufficient preparation, is the whole secret of success in extemporaneous speaking." A chapter is condensed in this one sentence, taken from Dr. Abel Stevens' work on the "Preaching Required by the Times." Most of our great extemporaneous preachers "are able because they think themselves able."

*Ecclesiastical Reform.*—Lord Verulam (whom many persons still persist in styling Lord Bacon) asks "why the Civil State should be purged and restored, by good and wholesome laws, made in every third or fourth Parliament, providing remedies as fast as time breedeth mischiefs, and contrariwise, the Ecclesiastical State should continue upon the dregs of time, and receive no alteration?"

*The Church Journal* says that the clergy are no longer honored for their work's sake, as they once were, and adds: "A clergyman with the learning of Origen or Jerome, would starve in the American church unless he had the capacity to be delighted in society, to preside properly at sewing societies, conduct a Sunday-school, and hold his own at vestry meetings."

*There is danger to Christianity*, but it does not approach from the direction

of Spiritualist Conventions at Chicago, or elsewhere. It comes from the lowered tone of Christian consecration, and the lowered standard of Christian consistency. The evil to be feared is from within rather than from without. A truthful, prayerful devoted career of duty is an argument which stultifies all the rhetoric and logic both, of the most eloquent of this class of radicals. It is to these like the autumn frost to the swarms of insects. It spoils all that they compliment with the name of reasoning. Let the Spirit of God be outpoured upon our churches; let such Pentecostal seasons return as have been more than once repeated in our Presbyterian history, and the voice of a misnamed "Spiritualism"—as material as any Gospel of despair—would die away to its last echo. It would be dismissed to oblivion as idle breath, and history, overcharged already with memorials of crusading atheists and insane defiers of revelation, would decline to accept any new encumbrances. The simple fact, of which these deluded enthusiasts seem to be utterly unconscious, is that the life of Christianity is beyond the reach, not only of the edicts of a Julian and the wit of a Voltaire, but of the most strenuous efforts of their futile malice.

*A missionary* in his report as to the field of his labor, says, "Methinks one reading this report says, 'Well, I will give five dollars to the cause of domestic missions. I can give this amount and not feel it.' Suppose, my Christian brother, you give twenty, and feel it? Your Saviour felt what he did for you. A remark of this kind once heard from the pulpit, thrilled through my whole soul, and made me do more than empty my purse. I borrowed from a friend. The idea of feeling what I gave was delightful."

*A missionary* at a station in South Africa, connected with the Scotch Free church, speaks of a recent revival at his station in connection with a week of special prayer. Whole nights were spent by some of the people on the hills in sending up their united cries to God for his presence and the outpouring of his spirit. As a fruit of this effort the church was greatly revived, and fifty-three new-born souls added to the church.

The most important mission of the London Missionary Society in the South Sea Islands was begun by the martyred Williams. Seventeen years passed, and nothing seemed to be accomplished. The board grew weary of delay, and it was moved to abandon the enterprise. One only withstood this—the late Dr. Haweis, author of the Communicant's Spiritual Companion—who persuaded them on the contrary, to increase appropriations and prayers; and almost immediately after this resolution was adopted, tidings came of that great work by which a "nation was born in a day" into that kingdom of God.

The friends of Pompey, when he was about to embark for the purpose of conveying provisions to the famishing people in Rome, endeavored to dissuade him from exposing himself to the perils of the sea voyage. He nobly replied, "*Necesse est, ut eam, non ut vivam*—it is necessary that I should go, not that I should live." A grand sentiment, though all men cannot appreciate it. It is the sentiment of the heroic missionary who exposes his life to inhospitable climes, and to barbarous and bigoted people for the good of souls. And this



rich, self-denying benevolence, has cheered many a one in a dying hour, and prompted the exclamation, "I have no regrets for what I have done. Oh that I had done more for Jesus and for souls!"

A letter from London says that Mr. Spurgeon's health makes it necessary that he should soon leave England for a few months' residence in a more congenial clime.

Native Christian chapels have been so far constructed along the 2,000 miles of the sea coast of China, that for 800 miles of that coast a footman might put up at a Christian chapel each night of the journey.

The Pacific says the California Congregational churches have taken a step forward in organizing a woman's board of missions for the Pacific coast, and already local auxiliary societies are forming at different points.

The managers of the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance are rejoicing in the circumstance that they succeeded in carrying it through without leaving a disagreeable debt on hand. The Conference paid for itself, besides paying those who went to it.

The Lee Avenue Baptist church in Brooklyn, Rev. J. Hyatt Smith's, has taken a still more definite stand on the open communion question, and declares that, with its present convictions, it cannot retrace its steps, even though the penalty be the withdrawal of recognition by the denomination.

The Prussian Government has absolutely resolved to abstain from any interference with the inner ecclesiastical organization of the dioceses during its struggle with the Romish church, and to confine its action to rigorously repelling any encroachments of the bishops upon state rights.

The Presbytery of Egypt, in connection with the United Presbyterian church, transacts its business and keeps its records in the Arabic language. At a late meeting there were present, as members of Presbytery, eight ministers (six of whom were missionaries and two natives) and five native elders.

Rev. S. H. Tyng, jr., is meeting with great success in securing large congregations to his Sunday evening sermons in Cooper Institute. He delivers extemporaneous prayers, and his discourses are eminently practical. The singing is congregational.

The American Bible Society has appointed the Rev. Bishop W. L. Harris, D.D., LL. D., of the Methodist church, who is now abroad, a delegate to the British and Foreign Bible Society, at their anniversary to be held in May. The whole number of volumes granted since the last meeting of the American Bible Society is 4,804, including 10 volumes for the blind, besides others, to the value of \$3,133.85. This was for the domestic work. For the work abroad 13,252 volumes were granted in books, and \$2,200 in funds.

The Jesuit missionaries in Madagascar are making rapid progress in their work. According to statistics given in one of their publications, they have now seventy-four places of worship in the central province, and forty-four priests, sisters of mercy and teachers in Antananarivo and vicinity. Their work already extends to nearly every important village.

Great interest is now awakened for Christianizing the Jews. More than \$300,000 were contributed in Great Britain alone, the past year, for this object. In Jerusalem there are sixty Jewesses meeting daily to hear the Gospel; ministers are now welcomed in every house at Jerusalem. Within the last sixty years, since the establishment of the society, 25,000 people have been converted to the Christian religion.

Rev. Dr. Cheney, lately consecrated a Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal church, administered the rite of confirmation, on Sabbath, the 4th inst., in Christ church, of which he has been rector for some years, in Chicago. He performed the service according to the form adopted by the new church.

Dr. Dollinger, the well-known German professor and opponent of the Papal Infallibility assumption, hearing recently that his former Roman Catholic friends had circulated the report that he had repented of his course and wished to be reconciled to the Pope, at once said, in terms which none could misunderstand, "It is an Ultramontane lie."

Lord Lawrence, late English Viceroy and Governor-General of India, uses this strong language in regard to foreign missionaries there: "I believe, notwithstanding all that the English people have done to benefit that country, the missionaries have done more than all agencies combined."

Dean Stanley, whose scholarship and position well entitle him to be considered of good authority on any question relating to Episcopacy, said in a sermon which he preached in a late visit to Edinburgh, that, as a matter of history, the apostles had no successors. Where, then, it may be asked, is the famous Roman Catholic and Episcopal doctrine of Apostolic Succession?

Ex-Marshal Bazaine, who has been made to know much of the vicissitudes of human life, has had the death-sentence which was passed upon him by the court-martial that tried him for treason, changed to twenty years' exile and confinement, and has been sent for this purpose to Sainte Marguerite, a fort on a small island in the Mediterranean, off the coast of France, and not far from the Cannes.

The congregation of the Madison Square Presbyterian church of New York city (Rev. Dr. Adams having resigned to assume the Presidency of the Union Theological Seminary) on Monday evening voted unanimously to call Rev. Joseph T. Duryea, D.D., of Brooklyn, with a salary of \$8,000, and \$2,000 additional for house rent. A committee, of which Dr. Adams is chairman, was appointed to present the call.



Prof. James Strong, S. T. D., of Drew Seminary, sailed from New York city on the 20th ult., in the Oceanic, accompanied by an engineer, a photographer, and several archaeological students. The party will spend a short time in Europe, visiting points of archaeological interest, and then proceed to the East, to spend several months in journeying over the ground lately discovered by Tristram in his Land of Moab. They will also travel in the desert and Upper Egypt.

The plan of many ministers in devoting the evening sermon, or the Wednesday evening lecture to the lesson of the school for the following Sunday is well calculated to advance all the interests of the church. It interests all in the particular subject under consideration, and helps to concentrate the thoughts of old and young, making them mutual helpers and searchers after those precious truths which exalt families and nations.

The International Lesson Committee is to meet in Philadelphia next month, to select lessons for 1875. It is understood that the lessons for the first half of the year are to be from the Old Testament, commencing with the book of Joshua, and for the last half in the gospel of John. The committee invite at all times suggestions from Sunday-school teachers and writers as to the number of lessons to be taken from any one book of the Bible, or the subject and length of particular lessons. Rev. John H. Vincint, of New York, is chairman, and Rev. Dr. Warren Randolph, of Philadelphia, secretary of this committee.

The following appears in the editorial columns of the *Independent* this week: "There is no truth whatever in the reports published in the daily papers that the *Independent* has been sold. No change whatever has occurred in its proprietorship or editorial management, and there is no prospect of any. It is true, however, that several very flattering and unsolicited proposals to purchase the paper have been recently made to us, from highly respectable parties; but they have all been respectfully declined."

Bishop Reinkens has issued a reply to the Pope's Encyclical, in which the following passage occurs: "The Pope who was most feared, and who was surrounded with the greatest splendor on earth, Innocent III., condemned the English Magna Charta, cursed it, appealed to the heavenly and terrestrial powers against it, and struck it with his anathema and interdict. Nevertheless, the Magna Charta did not fall; it made the people of England great; and who will say that the English nation has lost its Christianity?"

Dr. Parker, in his first sermon after his return home from the recent Alliance, made the following declaration: "It is not very agreeable to my patriotic impulse to say—and yet I must say it—that America is, in my opinion, on the point of laying its hand on the supremacy of the world. England has a magnificent history, but America has a still more magnificent future."

Juggernaut, the chief god of millions of the human family, is a coarse clump of wood, with a small box of quicksilver inside for a spirit.

As the highest estimate of the number of children now belonging to Sunday-schools in the United States is only 5,000,000, and assuming that the school age is from four years to twenty, which would give 15,000,000 children and youth in the country, it is evident that the American Sunday-school Union has a great field and a great work before it in establishing and sustaining new schools. Whenever its claims are brought up, these facts and figures should be recalled.

The Marquis and Marchioness of Bute, accompanied by Monsignor Capel, have both left England for Rome. It is said that their visit is connected with the establishment of a Roman Catholic university in England. If the scheme receives the sanction of the Pope, the Roman Catholic aristocracy have promised to give large pecuniary assistance. The Marquis of Bute's contribution will be £50,000.

The union of religious benevolent societies having similar work to do is now urged in many quarters. Consolidation is the order of the day, to promote harmony, efficiency and economy. A few men having personal interests at stake oppose such unions; but they must come, and the few should yield gracefully to the evident necessity.

Professor Christleib, at Bonn, Dr. Grundemann, pastor, at Morz, and Dr. Warneck at Barmen, propose to edit and publish a German Missionary Review, discussing all questions relating to the work of Christian missions, civilization and human progress. Such a periodical in such hands will command the attention of the religious world.

*Call Declined.*—Rev. J. B. Date, D.D., pastor of the Second United Presbyterian church of Philadelphia, on Sunday last, announced to his congregation that he had declined the call to a professorship in the Theological Seminary of Newburg, New York. The congregation indorsed his action by a rising vote.

*Private Confession.*—Dr. Pusey affirms that while the formularies of the Church of England do not justify any parish priest in requiring private confession as a condition of receiving the holy communion, yet all who claim the privilege of private confession are entitled to it.

Rev. Dr. Chambers, one of the Collegiate church pastors in the city of New York, is about to take a tour of Egypt and the Holy Land. We have no doubt it will prove a profitable tour both to himself and his people.

Rev. Dr. Kingston Goddard, formerly of New York, and more recently rector of an Episcopal church on Staten Island, has joined, it is announced, the Reformed Episcopal church movement. Numerous others, who are Low church men are spoken of.

There are more than sixty thousand Protestant churches in the United States. There are about three thousand Roman Catholic churches. These are facts to think of when estimating the power of religion in this country.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—MARCH, 1874.—No. 3.

---

WE HAVE AN ALTAR.

“THIS is positively declared in Hebrews 13, 10. It is affirmed in language so plain and explicit, that no one can deny or misunderstand it. As the people of God under the former dispensation, the Jews had an altar; so have Christians an altar. As they had their altar in their temple, so we should have an altar in our temple or church. And as they offered sacrifices on their altar, around which all the other worship revolved as around the central object of such worship, so there should be an altar in every Christian church on which, in some visible outward form a sacrifice should be offered; around which, as a central object, our worship should revolve. Hence, those who object to an altar in a church, and all that pertains to it, set themselves up against the Word of God and the practice of the primitive apostolic church, and are guilty of turning the worship of the church into ‘spiritualistic Gnosticism’ and humanitarian deism.”

Such, substantially, is the sort of seeming Scriptural argument by which the advocates of an “altar liturgy,” and a sacrificial altar sacrament, seek to support and defend their view.

One of the most dangerous, because deceptive, artifices of error, is to use the Scriptures for its purposes. True Christians love the Word of God, and are always ready to accept as truth all it teaches. It is, as it ought to be, their rule of faith. The advocates of any error, in doctrine and practice, know this. Although, therefore, those errorists themselves may not hold the authority of

the Bible to be supreme—though some of them may set more store by human churchly traditions, especially of the fourth and fifth centuries—they are ever ready to seize an opportunity of turning the Scriptures to account in teaching or vindicating their errors.

In some few cases the two-fold meaning of a word furnishes such an opportunity. Human language is not rich and full enough to supply a separate term or word for every particular truth or fact. Or it may be necessary, in revealing or stating some doctrine or fact, to make use of language in a *figurative* sense. In all such cases, it is true that the connection shows the sense in which the words are used, or that sense may be learned from other passages in which the same thing is set forth in other words. No one, therefore, who wishes to know exactly what the Bible teaches in regard to any point, need be long perplexed or go astray. But still advantage may be taken, consciously or unconsciously, of the fact just stated, and so an error be defended, apparently, by a fair appeal to the Bible.

Thus Romanists seem to support their false doctrine of transubstantiation by appealing to the words, "This is my body," and to some declarations of our Lord in the sixth chapter of John's Gospel.

By the same method are some found to defend their erroneous view of the Christian *altar*. And many good people may be, and no doubt are, misled in this way, or at least perplexed.

It will be well, therefore, to examine this point. Especially may it be profitable to look with some care to the declaration in Hebrews, as above quoted. What is meant when it is there affirmed that "*we have an altar.*"

*As commonly used*

Among evangelical Christians, the term altar signifies (1) *outwardly* or *locally* any place where prayer is offered, whether in the family, the social prayer-meeting, or the church; and (2) *spiritually* the devout thoughts and emotions with which such prayer is offered; that is, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving *spiritually* offered unto God. In either case the word is used in a *figurative* or a *spiritual* sense. This use of it was taken from some resemblance between the altars of ancient times, considered *spiritually*, and the acts of devotion in which it is the privilege and



duty of Christians to engage. But no evangelical Christian ever thought of using the word in the old sacerdotal and sacrificial sense.

Hence, the term never applied to the Lord's Supper in the early liturgies of the Reformed church. That is always said to be administered from or around a *table*. The contrary of this has, indeed, been asserted, but the assertion has not been proven.

In the course of time (and it was a comparatively long time) the word altar was often applied to the Lord's table. But even then it was done (as it still is in some of our German churches) in a figurative sense. No one thinks of it as an altar in the old (Jewish or Romish) sacerdotal and sacrificial sense. The propriety of even such a figurative use of the word may well be questioned, as Dr. Ruetenik has justly said in the *Evangelist*, recently, especially as its use may so readily be abused, as a means of misleading people, and

*Has been abused.*

The abuse consists in employing it to signify a literal altar of sacrifice, a place and an article of furniture in the church on which a real sacrifice is offered. This sacrifice may be called a memorial sacrifice. But that is only deceptive phraseology. For what is meant and said is, that the sacrifice is offered in, with, and under the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, so that it becomes an actual sacrificial transaction, and amounts, in fact, to a *disguised mass*. This might, of course, not at first be seen or suspected. But a fuller development of views on the subject, and a more unreserved declaration of what was meant by the phraseology, "memorial sacrifice," &c., could not fail to make the purpose clear and the meaning plain.

*No Scriptural warrant*

Can be found for such an altar in the Christian church. Least of all, does the declaration in Hebrews justify it. The true sense of that declaration rather goes directly against any such view of the matter. In proof of this we prefer quoting what has been admirably said on the subject by others, who have given it earnest consideration :

"It is assumed that the 'altar' here named, is the communion table, and, consequently, that the Lord's Supper is a sacrificial

service, and the officiating minister a sacrificing priest. Thus an attempt is made to bring in the whole sacerdotal system under cover of this assumed Scriptural authority.

"But such an application of these words is inconsistent with the context, violates the principles of sound interpretation, and is at variance with the plain meaning of the words, as they actually stand. For the context shows that the sin-offerings of the Jewish dispensation are here *contrasted with the sacrifice of the death of Jesus as the sin-bearer for man*, and therefore the altar must be the cross on which He died. And it is a mere make-shift to evade this meaning, by thrusting verses 11-14 into a parenthesis, in order to disconnect them with verse 10.

"It is also contrary to all legitimate interpretation to take this single expression, and, without any internal necessity, to give it a meaning which will fasten upon the subject of the Lord's Supper a view quite at variance with all elsewhere plainly declared about it in the New Testament. In every instance in which it is distinctly referred to, the words and the ideas of a *sacrifice* or an *altar* are altogether excluded.

"And if we take the words, 'we have an altar,' just as they stand, and in their most literal acceptance, what do they affirm? That as the older dispensation had an altar, so *we*, in the Christian dispensation, *have an altar*. Yes, the Jewish church had an altar—one altar—not an altar in every synagogue, but one only, divinely sanctioned altar in the temple, on which acceptable sacrifices were placed. And we, under the Christian covenant, have an altar—ONE ALTAR—not an altar in every church, but one only, divinely sanctioned altar—the cross of Christ—on which the one, fully perfect and accepted sacrifice was offered for us once for all. It was a criminal and superstitious will-worship when the Jews multiplied altars in their land. What will it be in us, if we set up an altar in every local church?

"To call the Lord's table, then, an 'altar,' is to give quite a different view of the subject from that which is really contained in this and other passages, and to extract that view from a solitary expression, which does not necessarily refer to that sacrament." (G. A. Jacobs, D.D., on *The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament*, pp. 305, &c.)

The author just quoted, wrote his book against the deceptive artifices of the Puseyites of England, whose seditious efforts to



subvert the faith of the English church has, unhappily, rendered much contending for the truth necessary. His view on the passage under notice, is fully sustained by the learned and pious John Owen, in his great work on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Owen says on the words, "we have an altar:"

"Some would have it (mean) a *material altar made of stone* (or wood), whereon an unbloody sacrifice of the flesh and blood of Christ is offered by priests every day. \* \* \*. And some think that the *table* which the church useth in the celebration of the Supper of the Lord, is here metaphorically called an altar. \* \* \*. But these things are wholly foreign to the design of the Apostle. The altar which we now have, is *Christ alone* and His sacrifice. For He was priest, altar and sacrifice, all in Himself, and continueth so to be unto the church, as unto all the use and efficacy of them. All this is evident in the context, for:

"(1). This altar here is, in its nature, use and efficacy, opposed unto the altar in the tabernacle (or temple), as it is expressly in the Apostle's words.

"(2). The Apostle declares in verses 12 and 15, who and what it is that he intends by the altar, viz., Jesus.

"(3). The *sacrifices we* are required to offer unto God, are such as have no respect unto (or use for) any material altar, but are such as are offered unto God, through Christ alone, like 'the sacrifice of praise,' (verse 15).

"(4). In those days (when the epistle was written), and for some ages after, Christians *had no material altars*, and *denied on all occasions that they had any.*"

Whilst not a single evangelical Protestant commentator understands this declaration in Hebrews as asserting the existence of a material altar in the Christian church, most of them refer what is said to the Lord Jesus Christ, in the sense given in the preceding quotations.

Only Romanists and Puseyites have heretofore contended that it means a material, sacrificial altar. Is it not significant, therefore, that there should be in *our* church any ministers who adopt the interpretations of Romanists and Puseyites on this subject? And yet, as our readers may see in the article following this one, that this is the sense in which the advocates of the new-order of worship take the words. To prop up an error, and give it the show of divine authority, the Sacred Scriptures are misinterpreted

and wrested from their plain spiritual sense. And this, alas, is not the only case in which this is done. We shall have occasion to notice some others.

In view of such perversions of the word altar, and especially in our day and church again, all can see the need of care in the use and application of the word. One of the most learned and faithful bishops of the Episcopal church was so deeply impressed with the pernicious use of the term, altar made in his church (it was McIlvaine, of Ohio), that he refused to dedicate a church with a so-called altar in it, and counseled the avoiding of the word. The counsel of such a man merits earnest consideration.

---

#### THE LITURGICAL QUESTION.

(Continued.)

FINALLY, the argument against free worship boldly attacks also the plausible assumption, that is better suited than the use of a liturgy to the manifold exigencies of public prayer, more full and comprehensive, and more capable of adapting itself to passing occasions and particular wants. The assumption, we say, is plausible; because that which is altogether unbound would seem at once to be of wider use and application than that which is held within fixed metes and limits. But we must be governed here not by theoretical possibilities, but by the actualities of real life; and looking only to these, it soon becomes manifest enough that this imaginary fullness and variety of free public prayer exists only in the fancy of those who seek to make capital out of it against liturgical forms. At times, indeed, the order of the comparison is reversed for the same end; liturgies, we are told, are apt to be too full, even to tediousness, while it is the privilege of free prayer to be general and short. But there is no room in truth for the disparaging contrast in either view. Liturgies may be, of course, too long, or they may be too short; and the gift of free prayer may be so exercised in certain cases, as to make the service all that it ought to be in comprehensiveness and variety, and nothing more; but what we are concerned with



now, is the relative suitableness of the two systems, as systems, in any whole view, and as tested by actual use, for reaching and securing in these respects what the idea of public prayer is felt to require. Instituting our comparison in this broad, practical way, we can come only to one conclusion. It is not in the nature of free prayer, in general practice, to be any thing like as full, as various, and at the same time solidly compact, as it is possible to have a good liturgy. How should it be expected that off-hand services of this sort, or services approaching to such character, should to any general extent be able to match at all, in this respect, the well-digested forms of a prayer-book which, to be worthy of the name, must embody in itself the results of long devotional experience, reaching back, in part, at least, to the earliest Christian times? This is confirmed abundantly by actual observation. Free pulpit prayers, as a general thing, however full they may be of verbiage, move in a comparatively narrow circle of topics and thoughts. You miss in them almost always much that is sure to meet you in any respectable liturgy. At the same time their topics are managed in a loose and desultory way, with much unmeaning common-place, and many changes rung on the same themes, making the whole tedious; so that in the end you have neither fullness, nor variety, nor concentration, but only a sort of treadmill movement, that involves no progress, but lets you down in the end pretty much where it took you up in the beginning. We speak not, of course, of all such free public prayers, but only of what they are prevailing, and, as it would seem, constitutionally, among unliturgical denominations in general. *Their natural character is to be jejune, confused, prosy, not sapid, not satisfying, nor nourishing for the soul.* An ordinarily good liturgy, over against them, deserves to be considered at any time a welcome enlargement and relief. It makes public worship every way more ample, more particular, more succinct, more nervous, and, strange as it may sound, more positively free. *For the misery of the extemporaneous system is, that its liberty is not joined with the strength that is needed for its whole work; so that it proves to be too generally the form only, without the real substance of freedom—the liberty, in other words, of being weak, and of doing in a weak way what there is no power of doing in a way that is strong.*

In such general style may the argument for liturgical worship be conducted, where the conception of a liturgy, after all, is nothing

more than that of a collection of prayers and other offices, thrown together in a common book. It may be questioned, indeed, as we shall see hereafter, whether the spirit of the controversy, at least, even in this form, does not necessarily refer itself to something deeper than such outward view, as being necessary to give such worship its full advantage over the system of free prayer. But this we let pass for the present.\*

As far now as this first notion of a liturgy goes, our own church, if we understand the matter rightly, is mainly of one mind, being well satisfied that it is desirable to have the worship of the sanctuary guided and supported, at least, if not absolutely ruled, by a book of forms. However it might have been some years since, it seems to be agreed now, all round, that the license of extemporaneous prayer, as it prevails so widely among our American sects, is not a good license; that it is not, on the whole, to edification; and that it needs, therefore, the restraint of some wholesome ecclesiastical prescription, in the form of a liturgy. We do not sympathize, as a church, with the common Puritanic prejudice against this mode of worship. We know better than to stigmatize it as necessarily formal, or cold, or flat. We are, in one word, with open acknowledgment, in favor of liturgical services; and for years now we have been endeavoring, under full Synodical sanction, to provide a proper liturgy for ourselves. We have not been able yet, it is true, to accomplish our purpose; but this has not changed at all our prevailing sense of its necessity and importance. The pains we have bestowed upon the subject have served only to convince us more and more that we need a liturgy, and that the ideas of Christian worship, which are growing upon us, can never be satisfied without one. We are already largely

---

\*Let what pass? The caricature of free prayer which has just been drawn! Allow Dr. N. his own "style" of arguing a case, let him put the case he wishes to determine or ridicule in such "style" as suits his purpose, and the case may easily be knocked to pieces.

It must be remembered that in all this railing at free prayer, the writer is chiefly giving vent to his own fancies and feelings, and does not represent those whose spokesman he assumes to be. Furthermore, the faults he lays to the charge of Free Prayer, lie not so much with it, as such, as they are chargeable upon the neglects of those entrusted with the training of young men for the ministry, in regard to the matter of worship. No intelligent advocate of Free Prayer denies the need of proper instruction in the duty of conducting this part of public worship. None favor or commend loose, unpremeditative extemporaneousness, &c. But if only a moiety of the time given to the laudation of such a cultus as the Committee advocates, were devoted to the cultivation of a spirit of prayer, and what belongs to leading this part of public devotion, most of the evils complained of would disappear.

The writer of the Tract goes throughout on the false assumption that the Spirit is no longer with the Lord's people as a Spirit of grace and supplication.



committed in our views and feelings to this order of worship, as being the most decent and becoming for the house of God ; so that it is no longer in our power easily to recede from these convictions, and to fall back again to what we have learned to regard as a lower level of thought. As a denomination, we honestly wish to have a liturgy. For the Eastern Synod, at least, of the German Reformed church, this has come to be a *desideratum*, a sort of crying want that will not be hushed or put down.

How does it happen, then, we may well ask, that we find it so difficult, after all, to produce a liturgy of a character suited to satisfy the general mind of the church? To reach the proper answer to this question, we must go on to consider that other conception of a liturgy, which needs, as we have said in the beginning, to be carefully distinguished from the notion of a *mere prayer book*—the view we have had under consideration thus far. The chief ground of our difficulty, there is good reason to believe, will be found to hold in a difference of mind among us with regard to this second theory or doctrine of what a liturgy means.

2. According to this second view, we may say, in general terms, a liturgy is not just a collection of prayers and other single forms of devotion, but a *whole order or scheme rather of public worship, in which all the parts are inwardly bound together by their having a common relation to the idea of a Christian altar, and by their referring themselves, through this, always to what must be considered the last ground of all true Christian worship, the mystical presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.* Here, however, are several things that call for separate consideration.

1. First of all, the conception requires that a liturgy should be ruled throughout by what we may call a sense of the *sacramental* in religion.

A sacrament is the presence of the supernatural, in a mystery, under a natural and sensible form. Christianity in this way has its central significance for faith in the Lord's Supper, the sacrament of Christ's body and blood ; and around this, accordingly, the worship of the church has revolved from the beginning. The old idea of a liturgy, indeed, as we know, was nothing more nor less than the celebration of this holy sacrament itself, which formed then the regular sanctuary service from week to week. It is easy to see how, in this case, every part of the service, every act, whether of prayer or praise, was necessarily conditioned by the

immediate connection in which it stood with that which formed the innermost theme of the whole transaction. Our modern worship is differently ordered. Instead of these frequent and constant communions, we have only occasional celebrations of the sacramental mystery, with long intervals between of worship in a different way. But we are not authorized, for this reason, to sunder the one kind of service, in our minds, from the other, so as to make the Holy Eucharist a particular office only, among other offices of like separate character and sense. The true idea of Christian worship requires that it should still hold under its old view, as a harmony of services meeting together in the solemnity of the Lord's Supper; and that what has been disjoined in time for our modern worship, and thus spread out, as it were, over weeks and months, instead of being kept together as a whole transaction on each single occasion, should be for us, notwithstanding, in spirit and in power, a single, grand system, as before, revolving around this glorious centre continually from one end of the year to the other. In accommodating itself to our changed circumstances, in other words, the old liturgical conception must so stretch itself over our ordinary services at other times, that they shall be felt to be still part and parcel always of what is transacted, at certain seasons, in the celebration of the Eucharist.\*

But now to preserve any proper regard for this order, it is plain that the church needs the help of a liturgy; and this not in the sense merely of a collection of precomposed offices and forms, but in the sense of an organic scheme of worship, based throughout on the central significance of the Lord's Supper, and so constructed as to teach and enforce the power of this thought in all its parts. There is a great interest here, which can never be effectually maintained, either by the system of free worship, or by the use of mere miscellaneous forms. *The difference between the unliturgical, and what we may call in such view the quasi-liturgical, would seem to be in this case of no material account.* The services of the sanctuary must ever have a tendency, under both characters, to fall away from the true idea of Christian worship altogether, and to lose themselves in mere spiritualities, that carry in them at last no sacramental force whatever. To uphold the power of a truly sac-

\*These are largely unwarranted assertions. Facts are against them.

Mark how the Tract defines the Sacraments of the Lord's Supper, and its disagreement with Reformed doctrines on the subject.



ramental worship, we need the use of a truly sacramental liturgy. No liturgy, then, can be worthy of its name, which is not framed in such way as to make the sacrament of the Lord's Supper its cardinal office, while all its other offices and parts are so ordered as silently, at least, to come under some inward relation to this, and to take from it their key-note and reigning tone.

2. Then, in the next place, such a liturgy must bear a certain *priestly character, determined by a proper regard throughout to the idea of a Christian altar.*

There is a style of religious thinking, we know, to which the very mention of anything like this is always unpalatable. It is willing to allow a priestly character and function to Christ in heaven, but will hear of nothing of the sort in the services of the church here below. There is a necessary connection between this style of thinking always and the unsacramental spirit already noticed. Where there is no sense of the mystical element in worship, growing forth from its universal centre in the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, there can be no power to sympathize with the priestly element, with its conceptions of altar and sacrifice drawn from the same source. Such a habit of mind, it is hardly necessary to say, is in either view equally unliturgical. It leads naturally to free worship, or, at best, to what may be called the liturgy of the pulpit—that sort of unbound-book service of which we have spoken before—as it is unquestionably the natural tendency, also, of both these sorts of worship, on the other hand, to produce and encourage the unhappy habit here in question. In opposition to this, a true liturgy, in the theory with which we are now concerned, may be denominated emphatically a liturgy of the altar. It has no disposition to disparage the reading-desk, or pulpit, as being the proper organs of address from the side of God to the people. It is willing to do all honor to the prophetic office, as well as to the kingly office of the church, in their proper times and places. But it demands that, in full analogy with these, the priestly office of the church shall also be recognized as something more than a metaphorical fancy or fiction; and that the declaration, "*We have an altar,*" shall not be stultified to mean, *We have a table only, and nothing more.\** Seeing the root and foun-

\*This is not the first time that the writer has mistaken and misapplied what is said in Hebrews about "*altar.*" The clear and undeniable testimony of the early history of the church is, that the *Lord's Table* was not regarded as equivalent to the sacerdotal altar of Judaism.

datation of all Christian worship to be in the mystical presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Holy Supper—and seeing in this again the exhibition of his broken body and shed blood as the actually present virtue of His one offering of Himself, “made once, but of force always, to put away sin”—it requires that some earnest be made with these *sacrificial ideas*, so that they shall be felt to carry with them the *power of a real transaction* at the time with God, based on something beyond the minds of the worshipers themselves.

We feel at once what the liturgical means, in this view, in *the old priestly services of the Jewish temple*, where the transaction of the altar served to mediate objectively, as we may say, between the hearer of prayer and His worshiping people. *In the same way*, it is held, the true Christian *leitourgia*—*the substance of which that older service was only the symbol and type*—*must ever circle, as a system of offices, round the Christian altar*, as something always mystically present in the Christian church. *Without this, worship ceases to be distinctively Christian, and becomes necessarily more or less Gnostically spiritualistic only, ending at last, indeed, in mere humanitarian deism.\**

It belongs to the full conception of a liturgy, then, that it be in the fullest sense of the word *an altar service*. There must be that in its whole tone and spirit, which causes the congregation to feel that *the distinction between pulpit and altar* is not an idle distinction; that it is not enough to say all depends on the mind of the worshiper here, without any regard to outward object or place; that the idea of a Christan sanctuary requires the actual localization, in some way, of the thought of the altar, as much as the localization of a Moses' seat for the purposes of religious instruction; and that being so determined to its own proper location,

---

That Philadelphia “Messenger” tries hard to uphold the false notion. But why does it not honestly meet what the Evangelist (Dr. Reutenick) said in reply to its misstatements? Excepting in a figurative spiritual sense (as family altar, &c.) there is no altar in the Christian church, and never was one of the sort meant by the Committee and the Tract. And Dr. Fisher never saw one any where, in his early days, in a Reformed church which was meant for *such* an altar, or called such.

---

\*This is a regular popish bull. Happily such denunciations have often proven themselves to be *vox et præterea nihil*. Every body understands by this time of how small account such Nevinite anathemas are. But think of the impudence of pronouncing such a sentence, and so pompously, upon every thing which does not exactly square with the writer's notion of *what worship ought to be*.



*the altar*, and not the pulpit, is to be regarded as *the central object of the sanctuary—the place of the Christian shekinah—forth from which must radiate continually the entire glory of God's house*. No liturgy of this sort can bear to be used from the pulpit; and no people in sympathy with the genius of worship, under such priestly view, can ever be satisfied with mere pulpit prayers in any form.

3. In the third place, the idea of a liturgy, as we are now considering it, involves an active correspondence with the movement of the Christian life, in the form of what is known commonly as the *church year*.

We will not stop now to analyze closely the nature of the connection between this spirit and what we have been trying thus far to describe, as the sense of the sacramental and priestly joined together in the sense of the Christian altar. Enough to say in general terms, that it grows out of the way in which the great truths of Christianity are apprehended in both cases, as having the character not just of theological doctrines, but of facts, rather, objectively real and historical facts, of perennial power and force in the world. What lives for us in this way has a tendency always to enshrine itself for our thoughts, in outward forms both of space and time. Thus it is that the Creed, moving in the very process of the Christological mystery itself, will not, where it prevails, suffer the sense of that everlasting fact to die out of the mind of the church, but secures for it, we may say, *an abiding sacramental presence in every Christian temple, and upon every Christian altar*. And where this feeling of historical faith prevails, it is only in keeping with it that the circle of the year, the natural measure of existence for us in time, is made also to take up into itself commemoratively the great phenomenal facts of redemption, causing them to roll round us in perpetual cycles, like "lights in the firmament of heaven, to give light upon the earth." Account for it as we may, nothing, at all events, is more undeniably true, than that there is an inward connection, in some way, between the sense for the sacramental in worship, and what may be termed a sense for church festivals, and the idea of a church year; and it is no less certain that this latter feeling enters, then, as truly as the other into the conception of the liturgical, as we have it here in hand.

In the system of free worship there can never be any hearty sympathy with the Christian year, and it will be sure, with the progress of time, to fall into universal neglect. Even such cardinal

seasons as Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, will not be able to command any religious observance ; and much less, of course, will this be the case with any subordinate festivals. It is felt to be a bringing down of Christianity from its proper spiritual elevation, to think of binding it in this way to the conditions of our purely mundane life. St. Paul's reproach to the Galatians, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years," is applied at once to the whole case. All such worship is set down as a "turning again to the weak and beggarly elements" of Judaism ; and so the entire scheme of it is swept away as a "relic of popery," to make room for a system in which the only sacred day is the Sabbath, and all Sabbaths are monotonously the same from one end of the year to the other.\*

Here again, also, it is plain that a mere pulpit liturgy—a collection, simply, of written prayers—offers of itself no help for this undervaluation of church festivals, but is most likely, rather, on the whole, to show itself as indifferent toward the true spirit of them, in the end, as the system of free prayer itself.

But no true altar liturgy can be thus indifferent ; and it may be taken universally as a distinctive criterion of such a liturgy, that the sense of the old ecclesiastical year finds in it its natural and proper home. It belongs to such a liturgy to be an echo and response to the religious sentiment in this form, while it serves, at the same time, by its whole construction, powerfully to awaken the sentiment, and to strengthen it in the way of education, from infancy on to old age.†

*(To be continued.)*

---

THERE may be preachers who consider themselves complimented by being called "deep ;" but when was there a preacher more profound than Jesus Christ ; and yet the "common people heard him gladly," because he was so intelligible and simple.

---

\*Unfounded, extravagant assertions, devoid of proof. With his facility in such declamation, the writer's wild imagination might have kept up its flight over a dozen such pages of bluster.

†And yet how utterly "the true altar liturgy" has failed in past times to do what is here claimed for it. An ounce of fact will outweigh a ton of such baseless fancies.



## JESUS, THE PERFECT MAN.

BY REV. H. H. W. HIBSHMAN.

ONE marked trait of the sons and daughters of fallen Adam, is their utter inability to attain moral perfection and become acceptable to God, their Maker. This is clearly taught in the Scriptures, and confirmed by the experience and observation of mankind universally. Sin alienated man from God, fettered his will, vitiated his affections, weakened his conscience, blinded his judgment, perverted his understanding and brought ruin and misery upon him. The moment God's law was transgressed man walked in the midst of all moral corruptions with pollution and guilt upon his soul. The result of this sinful alienation of man from God, is eternal death : separation from God and the felicities He affords forever.

To bring man to God, perfect man must appear in the world as sinful man's substitute to suffer vicariously in his behalf, securing for him by the propitiatory shedding of blood, the remission of sin, and by His death on the accursed tree—the Cross—eternal life.

Jesus Christ is this perfect man, who by His *active* and *passive* obedience to the divine law, made it possible for sinful man to enjoy again the favor of God, be pardoned of all his sins, both original and actual, and live in eternal happiness to glorify and praise God.

*This is evident from the constitution of His person.*

In the constitution of His person, Jesus differs from every other man. There never was any one like Him in ages past, and never will one be born like Him in ages to come. As He transcends all the great, the wise and the good men in all periods of time, in moral grandeur and sublimity of virtue, so also does He surpass all in the perfection of His person. Such is the mystery of it, that the most exalted idea given by pens most fully inspired, does not enable finite intellect to comprehend it. It is a mysterious constitution. The harmonious union of the Divine nature with the human, without "mixture" and "confusion." In His person true divinity with true humanity are united. Jesus is both God and man. Truly God, and truly man—Divine-human—the God-man. This is the controlling idea of all the Old and the New

Testament writings in unfolding the plan of redemption through a Saviour promised and given by God the justly offended.

The illustrious prophecy of the Saviour by Isaiah, describes Him as Son of God and also as son of Man. "*Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulders; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.*"—Is. 9: 6.

"*The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory as of the only begotten of the Father,*" John 1: 14. "*The Word was God,*" John 1: 1. "*Fear not,*" said the angels to the Shepherds in the plains of Bethlehem, "*for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord,*" Luke 2: 10, 11. "*God was manifest in the flesh,*" writes Paul to Timothy, 1 Tim. 3: 18. Peter writes, "*Christ was put to death in the flesh,*" 1 Peter 3: 18. Evangelists and Apostles teach that Jesus is in one person both the Son of the living God and the Son of Man.

He must necessarily be such a person, or the hopes of the world are blasted. For there can be no enjoyment of true happiness in this life, and no prospects of future rest, without re-union with God. The term religion, familiar to Pagan and to Christian, signifies this. It is compounded of two Latin words *re, back*, and *ligare, to bind*: *re-ligare, religion to bind back*. Religion to be true must bind back to God, from whom alone true felicity can be derived. The sinner must be hid in God, hence we say, with exultant joy, "*Our life is hid with Christ in God.*"

The desire for happiness is innate. When God created man, He implanted it in his bosom. And as long as man dwelt in Eden he possessed it. He was with God, and God was with him. When man fell and lost his bliss, the desire for bliss, joy and felicity was not lost. "*It is inseparable from human nature in every stage of existence, and will flourish in eternity.*" And it will be part of man's misery in the region of darkness—a gnawing worm that dieth not in his heart—insatiable, with nothing to feed on but the angry flames of the pit.

The pursuits among men to gratify this desire are multifarious.

"Some place the bliss in action, some in care,  
Those call it pleasure, and contentment there."



Notice the conduct of men. The miser seeks his happiness in bowing before mouldering gold gods until his soul is shriveled and dead to everything noble and good—the drunkard seeks it in the bitter, venomous cup of intoxication—the glutton in feasting on the luxuries of this life—and the debauchee in the gratification of sensual desire, prostituting his soul to all kinds of lust. But all is delusion. Riches, honors, and all earthly pleasures are transitory things. They fade in the hour of death like mist before the sun. Then man awakens to the reality that nothing is true and solid in this world; nothing satisfying to the innate desire for happiness but union, or reconciliation with God the eternal. What is hell but separation from God. And what is heaven, or happiness, but union with God—saved forever.

*How shall this union be obtained?*

Through the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Not, however, through Him only as the Son of Man, neither through Him only as the Son of God, but through Him as the God-Man. Jesus would not be a Mediator if He did not unite in His person "the whole fullness of the God-head, and the whole fullness of sinless manhood."

Real man, free from sin, could not be a medium, or link, to reunite sinful man to God. It requires more than a real sinless man to reinstate the being who by his rebellious act forfeited God's favor, and lost all his Divine gifts, to enjoy again the presence of God and such society as Adam enjoyed in Paradise.

Adam, the progenitor of our race, was a real man and without sin, and fell, like the stars fall from heaven. By his own deliberate act, enticed by Satan, he rent the beautiful garment of innocence with which he was robed, and admitted into his heart the prince of darkness. He brought ruin on himself and on all his posterity. He turned the Paradise of earth into a desolate wilderness. The Divine being withdrew from him. The clouds of glory that canopied his abode faded into darkness. He became the victim of spiritual disease. Life was lost. Terror reigned within and without him. He drank in sin. It made quick work. It brought death. "The wages of sin is death." And this painful, loathsome malady, he entailed on all his children. None are exempt. It is rampant everywhere. As rampant in Europe as in Asia; as rampant in

America as in Africa; as rampant in the nineteenth century as it was in the dark, mediæval ages, or in the family of Adam when Cain slew Abel. Jesus, as mediator between a holy God and sinful humanity must, therefore, be more than a real, sinless man. If a real, sinless man did not maintain his personal dignity, his moral power to resist evil, his high and glorious privilege of intercourse and converse with God in Eden, it would have been utterly impossible for him to maintain his righteousness, and also assume and endure the punishment required to atone for sin in a world of sin, to procure for others the favor of God and exemption from eternal punishment.

It is true, beyond controversy, that Jesus had to be real, sinless man, to be the middle-man between God and the sinner, between heaven and earth, to be the way to the Father—the prophet to reveal God's will—the healer of the nations of the earth—the sacrifice for sin with which alone God's justice could be satisfied—the advocate to intercede for believers with the Father—the medium through which the Holy Ghost could come into the world, as the abiding divine presence, to qualify sinful men for the glory of heaven and the enjoyment of its felicity; but He had to be more than mere man to be mediator in office—He had to be God, very God. He had, as mediator, to combine in His person the natures of both God and man, to bring God and men together. He must have influence with God and sinful man, and both God and man must meet in Him. If He were *only* man, God could not confide to Him the work of redemption; for the first man, Adam, although the crowning work of God's creative power, as a mere man, fell. But Jesus Christ is of the same essence with God the Father, as to His divine nature—co-equal, consubstantial and co-eternal with God—God's only begotten. "Thou art My son; this day have I begotten Thee." God the Father declared His confidence in Jesus when He entered upon His Messianic work publicly. "*It came to pass that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape, like a dove, upon Him; and a voice came from heaven, which said: Thou art my beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased*" —Luke 3: 21, 22.

On the other hand, if Jesus were only an apparition, "a mere shadowy phantom," a spirit, Son of God and not also Son of Man, sinful beings would shrink from Him, striving to get out of



His way and conceal themselves from His presence. This was the case with Adam, before the Gospel was preached to him, when yet in Paradise. When he heard the still, small voice of God at a distance, he and his wife "hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God"—Gen. 3: 7.

Jesus is the perfect man, being both God and man in one person. When this union was effected by the wonderful operation of the Holy Ghost, it was effected indissolubly. God's Son remains incarnate forever. It is inexplicable. It is above all miracles. It is the ineffable effect of the glorious wisdom and matchless goodness of the Lord God Almighty. We cannot understand it, but it is an historic fact that enters into the whole superstructure of our world-purifying religion. Take away this article of Christian faith, and you eviscerate the whole Gospel. Without it there is no basis or rock whereon to stand sure and steadfast. The person of Jesus Christ is in this sense represented as the root from which our Christianity grows. It is the beauty and glory of our soul-purifying religion; the rock of the true Christian church. "*Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*"—Matt. 16: 16. This being so does not, therefore, define "the church a continuation of the mystery of the incarnation." Our Catechism, in the 54th question, defines "*the church to be that assembly, or congregation of men, chosen of God from everlasting to eternal life, which the Son of God, from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends, and preserves to Himself, by His spirit and word, out of the whole human race, agreeing in true faith.*"

But not to digress too much. The divine and human natures subsisting in the individual person of Jesus, gives our religion præminence to all other forms of religion. If Jesus were not the person we describe Him to be, there would be no more efficacy and virtue in His blood than in the blood of any other creature slain; no power to make believers in Him beautiful in their lives, and ultimately perfect in the entire man; no power by which to attain to the highest degree of perfection. Ryle says: "The constant, undivided union of the two perfect natures in Christ's person is exactly that which gives infinite value to his mediation, and qualifies Him to be the very mediator the sinner needs."

As God-man, He revealed the will of God to a dying, perishing

world; wrought miracles in confirmation of His divinity and of His mission to the world; shed His precious blood and died on the cross, accomplishing the end for which He as God became manifest in the flesh; rose from the dead, as the resurrection and the life. He only is Saviour of the world. Only a God-man can save sinners. In Him as perfect man, His manhood sustained by true divinity, we behold our sins punished on the cross, the ground and foundation of salvation. The incarnation of the Son of God was the fulfillment of the promise to Adam and Eve in the garden, and consequently pointed to His death on the cross. "Without shedding of blood, no remission of sins." That which Christians should see in Jesus, the perfect man, "is a divine person, made sin and a curse for them, and allowing that very sin that has poisoned the world to be imputed to Him, and laid upon His head. It is easy to sneer at the *words*, 'vicarious sacrifice' and 'imputed merit,' as nowhere to be found in Scripture; but it is not so easy to disprove the fact, that the *ideas* are constantly to be met with in the Bible."

While the incarnation of the Son of God is the starting point of everything else in the plan of redemption, by a substitute and representative, it is not the "central fact" of the Gospel. It was only God's wonderful means to accomplish His wonderful and benevolent designs of saving His people by "a vicarious sacrifice." All honor and glory to God for man's salvation, for he is not saved by works, lest any man should boast—Ephe. 2: 8, 9.

*The testimony of God concerning Jesus.*

Three things are stated very distinctly in the Scriptures concerning Jesus:

First. *That He is God.* "The Word was God." "All things were made by Him." "The church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." "Who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness." "There are three that bear record in heaven—the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." (John 1: 1; Acts 20: 28; Rom. 1: 4; 2 John 5: 7).

Second. *That He is man.* "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men—the man Christ Jesus." "The book of generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David." "But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive



sins." "Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father, with His angels." "In the body of His flesh through death." (1 Tim. 2: 5; Matt. 1: 9; 9: 6; 16: 13; Rom. 1: 3; Col. 1: 22; 1 John 4: 2).

Third. *That Jesus is God-man.* "The Word was made flesh." "He partook of flesh and blood." "Before Abraham was, I am." "I am with you alway (not bodily; but spiritually), even unto the end of the world." "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." "Had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." (John 1: 14; Heb. 2: 14; John 8: 38; Matt. 28: 20; Heb. 1: 1, 2; 1 John 4: 3; Rom. 1: 6; 1 Cor. 2: 8).

H.

---

#### DORNER ON NEVINISM.

WE have read the entire proceedings of the late Evangelical Alliance at New York, with a great deal of pleasure and profit. Many of the papers read there are exceedingly valuable. Præeminent among them stands the remarkable paper by Dr. Dorner on "Papal Infallibility and Nominal Protestantism." It must be admitted that he goes to the bottom of the subject, and almost every sentence is worth its weight in gold. Dorner is, in many respects, a remarkable man. His mind is so penetrating, and has so wide a sweep, and his mere learning is so extensive, that one always feels as if in the hands of a master. He is withal so thoroughly *protestant* and so free from mere subjective theories, that it is always refreshing to read him, whether we take in hand his elaborate work on the "Person of Christ," or his address before the Alliance.

In this address, after unveiling the false Catholicism of the modern infallible Roman church, he devotes his attention also to a similar false tendency, not in Protestantism itself, but in a number of *nominal* protestants, who have been laboring with might and main for over twenty years, to undermine Protestantism in its inmost foundation, under the mistaken impression that they were called upon to *rectify* work which had been imperfectly wrought out in the 16th century. This he calls "nominal protestantism." The fol-

lowing descriptive delineation from his address has already been published in the *Monthly* (Nov. 1873, p. 567), but it seems to us worth while again to republish it and to call special attention to it in the way of comment and elucidation. Dorner says:

"There is a tendency, still more extended, to substitute for the ancient, conscious, personal form of piety, an impersonal form, which lives in shadowy and æsthetic feelings of an indefinite kind. This they accomplish by means of gorgeous ceremonial and manifold symbolism; by subordinating the preaching of the Word to the Liturgy and the Sacrament; by the propagation of Christianity rather by cramming the mind with Christian material, than by leading to Christian knowledge and the personal appreciation of the truth of salvation; by sensuous forms and ceremonials, to which spiritual indolence ascribes the power of pervading the entire man, as a fluid, with magical influence. And connected with this there is likewise an unevangelical emphasis of the power of the keys, and a Romanizing distinction between the clergy and laity, which is rooted in the unevangelical doctrine of sacramental ordination. This method, which is a reaction from evangelical Christianity, is unfruitful in religion, is unsuited to the needs of the present age, and to the ever-youthful Gospel and to its regenerative powers. It is related to the present as a peevish old man, who would carefully guard a rich inheritance, yet allows it to rust and spoil, because he does not increase it by use, and does not continually coin and distribute the noble metal of the Gospel. The church will never in this way prevail over the masses of the people who are estranged from it. Rather this leaven of Romanism, which has again been brought in, leads back behind the reformation, of which it speaks with unhappy retractions and regrets, while it takes away or shakes the evangelical assurance of faith, destroys the present evangelical unity, misleads, if not to apostasy to Rome, yet to weak effort to establish, on evangelical soil, a kind of duodecimo Popedom in every congregation. But we cannot linger longer *by this fatal stream, which now flows through the evangelical church of more than one land.* It has already been condemned by what has been said with reference to the modern Romish church, of which it is but a dwarfish, inconsistent copy."

The first question will naturally be, what does Dorner mean by the "foul stream which now flows through the evangelical church



of more than one land?" He is well acquainted with Puseyism in England, high-Lutheranism in Germany, and, as we know from his writings, with Nevinism in America. It is, hence, quite easy to see whom he has in his mind. Dr. Dorner, as the historian of Protestant doctrine for the last three centuries, has a thorough and intimate acquaintance with the theological streams that have been, and are, flowing hither and thither in the Protestant churches. We judge, then, that he had in mind:

1. German Puseyism, *i. e.*, a high-churchly movement that arose in the Lutheran church of Germany some twenty-five years ago, which has been industriously inculcated, but has made really no perceptible progress with the mass of the people.

2. English Puseyism, *i. e.*, that which made so great a stir twenty years ago in England, extending afterwards to the United States, and which carried so many ministers of the Episcopal church into the Roman church. This movement is still strong in England, and in the Episcopal church in this land; but it has lately taken a rather ritualistic form, especially in the large cities. So strong is it in England, that lately many hundreds of ministers united in a petition for the formal restoration of the confessional. In this country this tendency lately called forth the secession of Bishop Cummins and the formation of a new denomination, under the title of "Reformed Episcopalian church."

3. *Nevinism in the Reformed church.* This is a movement of the same kind as the others, differing somewhat, though not essentially, in theory, but particularly of the same spirit and genius. What is most remarkable in this movement is, that it should have arisen in the *Reformed* church, without any adequate cause or occasion, in a communion which one would think to be at the greatest possible remove from any danger in this direction.

Suppose we now examine this description more specifically, and see whether Dr. Dorner has really "hit the mark," grasped the matter in its principles, and properly and justly held it up to the gaze of the world:

*"To substitute for the ancient, conscious, personal form of piety, an impersonal form, which lives in shadowy and æsthetic feelings of an indefinite kind."* All will recognize this as correct and life-like. All insisting upon a conscious, personal form of piety, is too often denounced as either Pietism or Puritanism; and the teaching that men are redeemed in principle by the redemption of generic

humanity, by Christ's becoming incarnate, is certainly a "new" substitute for the ancient, conscious form of piety. It is true the new-order men are not clear, nor even consistent, on this subject, and know well how to help themselves out of all such difficulties, by loudly affirming that this is the system of the Catechism, and they alone are carrying it out rightly. But nobody need be deceived by such representations.

"*This they accomplish by means of gorgeous ceremonial,*" &c. This description is applicable to Nevinism, in part at least. True, they do not yet come forward to the same extent as the Ritualists in the Episcopal church, with "gorgeous ceremonial;" but this is not because they do not desire it, or approve of it, but because the time has not yet come when it can be safely done. Dr. Nevin formally approved of such things years ago. "The church is not yet educated up to it." The new-order of worship has introduced a large amount of ritualistic observances, that seem strange to Reformed eyes and ears; but then they admit we dare not yet submit the book to a constitutional vote, because "the church is not yet educated up to it." They say it is the wish of the church (meaning the priests who constitute the church) that the people be educated up to it. To this end they commence with the Sunday-schools and the children; and where *the people* are opposed to it, the authority of the clergy is so emphasized as to overbear the authority of the people, and the new-order is *forced upon an unwilling people*. Besides, in some churches, new-modeled to suit Nevinism, do we not see the new ideas carried out in the new furniture, new arrangements, and new posturings? "Ei das ist ja fast Catholisch," says the simple-hearted Reformed man, when he is present for the first time. "Oh, but the Synod wants it, and the voice of the Synod is the voice of God. You must not resist the work of the Holy Spirit." As though it were not the right and the duty of *the people*, by express command of the Apostle, "to try the spirits, whether they be of God."

"*An unevangelical emphasis of the power of the keys.*" Yes, we have had that over and over again. The *Mercersburg Review*, especially, (and the *Messenger*, also), have again and again given an unevangelical emphasis to the power of the keys. We all know how it has been insisted upon, that no believer can be assured of the forgiveness of his sins until, by the power of the keys, his absolution has been spoken by the priest. This is certainly un-



evangelical, and directly in the face of the Heidelberg-Catechism doctrine of the power of the keys.

*"A Romanizing distinction between the clergy and laity."* We have often seen and heard this unevangelical distinction insisted upon. We have heard one prominent man gravely argue, that church judicatories should be composed of clergy alone, because it was the business of the clergy to teach, and of the people to—obey.

*"Which is rooted in the unevangelical doctrine of sacramental ordination."* Dr. Dorner hits the mark here most certainly. We all know that the Revised Liturgy, in substance, really makes ordination a sacrament. To deny this, simply exposes the disingenuousness or ignorance of the person making such denial. Not only is that formula unevangelical, but it is impossible even to use it in an evangelical sense. Hence, in practice, it is seldom used in full.

*"A reaction from evangelical Christianity."* Dr. Dorner here gives us, very plainly, his deliberate judgment, that this method is a *reaction* or recoil from evangelical Christianity. So we have learned to know and estimate it. So history will characterize it. So every *sound* judgment will in the end regard it. Our ears may be filled with the cry, that it is "development," progress," &c.; but the more this is urged, the more plain does it become that the whole movement is in fact a retrogression. There can be no development in Protestantism, except its fundamental principle, justification by faith, be preserved. Mercersburg obscures and lets fall this principle. It goes back to the ancient church of the fourth or fifth century, and by its private judgment picks out from it what it loves and wishes, arbitrarily interprets what it takes, so as to suit its own theories; and having gone back so far, it makes a mighty leap over the Reformation period, and, in the name of progress, presents us a discordant and impracticable scheme, which some of its most ardent advocates have found to be more unsatisfactory than the infallibility of Rome.

*"Unfruitful in religion."* This is Dr. Dorner's judgment. Rather a harsh judgment. But the question is, is it true, so far as our church is concerned? We must admit that the judgment of different men in our church is very diverse on this subject, according to their several stand-points. The Nevinites claim, and no doubt honestly, that, in their judgment, the Mercersburg movement has been very "fruitful in religion," so far as the Reformed

church is concerned ; that in the last twenty years the church has grown very rapidly ; that the Catechism has been reinstated in its proper place ; that the church, as a whole, is obtaining a more prominent and influential position in the land ; that this movement is powerfully influencing other denominations ; and that it is a great credit to us that we should thus be in the "van of Protestantism."

On the other hand, our judgment (we trust it is impartial) is, that this increase of the church has not taken place *in consequence*, but rather *in spite* of the Mercersburg innovations ; that the Catechism is just as fruitfully used by the opponents of Nevinism ; that this scheme is not exerting any appreciable effect upon any denomination.

So far as individual congregations are concerned, our observation has convinced us, that in *every case* it has proven a hindrance to the Gospel and the growth of the church. We know that this is candidly acknowledged by some who are in the movement. Let each observer judge for himself.

It cannot be denied that it has brought *great discord* into many congregations, and especially with the Classes, Synods, and the General Synod. This latter it came near breaking up, and it may yet destroy it. It has brought great discord into our papers, and into our missionary and other operations. We know well that these results are ascribed to the opposition to Mercersburg. It is even said, that if no opposition had been made, Forney and the other perverts would not have gone to Rome ! Therefore, all these acknowledged evils are ascribed to the opposition made to the introduction of the novelties ! Whoever cares to be deceived by such argumentation, is welcome to do so. We are only showing forth the legitimate fruits of this "foul stream flowing" in our church. To our mind its effects *have been blighting* just in so far as it has come really to prevail.

"*Is unsuited to the needs of the present age.*" Dr. Dorner, we suppose, means this that the present age is becoming greatly estranged from the church, practically by standing more and more outside of the church, and theoretically, by openly calling in question the authenticity of the revelations of God. How shall we win back these estranged masses ? By going back to the system (if such it can be called) of the fifth and sixth centuries, which confessedly contained the germs of Romanism ? By exalt-



ing the claims of the church, in the Mercersburg sense? By preaching and teaching doctrines which are shadowy in themselves; which few can understand (not even their advocates themselves); which are unproven, mere theories and hypotheses, born of temporary philosophical notions; and which are repugnant to the plain sense of God's revealed Word? Can you win back the masses by telling them that they were redeemed generically in the fact of the Lord's incarnation, and that they were regenerated and delivered from the power of the devil when they were baptized? By telling them that the minister obtains the Holy Spirit by his ordination, so that he *can absolve sin*, and that they cannot be assured of the forgiveness of sin save through this priestly absolution? That his preaching must be accepted as the authoritative teaching of God, even though he be himself wavering between Protestantism and Romanism? Can you win them back by long and tedious liturgical formulas, by an *apparent* participation in the services, in the way of dutifully hunting up the responses, and uttering them correctly at the proper places? Hardly. Nor is it within the experience of any of our liturgical churches, so far as we can learn, that they are rapidly winning back the masses. Rather the masses stay away. The most of them can hardly keep together what they already have.

As for the scientific world, the humanitarianism and materialism of the present age, pray what earthly effect do Dr. Nevin's theories have, or can they have, to meet this growing evil? So far as we can judge, his elaborate essay at the Evangelical Alliance seems to have fallen still-born to the ground.

"*Rather this leaven of Romanism, which has again been brought in, leads back behind the Reformation.*" A very pregnant sentence, containing a world of truth in a nut-shell. It is a "leaven of Romanism." Surely, this is daily becoming more and more apparent. It starts *professedly*, where Romanism *actually* started, in the fifth and sixth centuries. Instead of going forward *historically* through the succeeding centuries, it goes forward by Dr. Nevin's private judgment, selecting what he wishes, rejecting what he chooses, and of course it comes to a different result somewhat. And yet the result is not greatly different. Wolff could go over to the Roman church without renouncing his Mercersburg principles. He says these were "guide-posts" pointing to Rome. Possibly he was not able to spell them out correctly. Many others

are precisely in the same fix. The step from Mercersburg to Rome has been a very easy one (especially where men had no wives and children). That "it leads back behind the Reformation" cannot well be denied.

"*Of which (the Reformation) it speaks with unhappy retractions and regrets.*" True to the very life, as we have learned to know Nevinism. How often have our Reformed hearts been pained at hearing this within the last twenty years, commencing with the articles on "Cyprian," and reaching down to the present day? How often have Calvin, and Ursinus, and the Reformers generally, been spoken of in disparaging terms? How often has the question been joyfully raised, whether Protestantism is not a failure? The very fact of such a sweeping overthrow of the old, as the Mercersburg movement proposes, shows that it regards Protestantism as either an imperfect work, or a failure, or a mistake.

"*It takes away or shakes the evangelical assurance of faith.*" This we know is vehemently denied. But it is really true. Mercersburg, in our judgment, has laboriously wrought to undermine and overthrow the old foundation of our certitude of salvation through faith, born of the preaching of the gospel and confirmed by the sacraments, by substituting for it a mere obedience to sacramental rites, confirmed by the official assurance of a priest in absolution. Either Mercersburg does not mean what it says by this, or it has fatally shaken the *evangelical* assurance of faith. We know, too, that quite consistently, it does not love the term "Evangelical."

"*Destroys the present Evangelical unity.*" Dorner, we suppose, means the present real union of protestant christians in one faith of justification and the spirit. Certainly the high-church movement, in all its phases, does all it can to destroy, hinder, embarrass and scout this unity. This was curiously illustrated by the high-church out-cry raised against Bishop Cummins and the Dean of Canterbury, because of their engaging in the communion in a Presbyterian church. True, Drs. Nevin and Krauth were at the Evangelical Alliance. They were *at* it, but evidently not *of* it. Have we not heard Mercersburg men abuse the Alliance as an infidel body, because it recommended days of prayer for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost? One of them expressed his regret that high-churchmen of all kinds cannot be called together in an Alliance. We remember that Prof. Higbee, some years, ago pro-



posed such an alliance, but met no response. We hope they will not let that project rest. It would really be interesting to see a Puseyite Alliance in session, composed of such leading men as Bishop Tozer of Zanzibar, Higbee of Mercersburg, Graban of Buffalo (if he be yet alive), Pusey of Oxford, and others.

*"Misleads, if not to apostasy to Rome, yet to weak effort to establish on Evangelical soil, a kind of duodecimo Popedom in every congregation."* This is plain and clear to every one. We have seen numberless instances of these "duodecimo Popes" in congregations.

*"But we cannot linger by this foul stream which now flows through the Evangelical church of more than one land. It has already been condemned by what has been said with reference to the modern Romish church, of which it is but a dwarfish, inconsistent copy."* The Modern Evangelical Theology of Germany, speaking through Dr. Dorner, calls this a "foul stream." This is fully as severe a judgment as has ever been expressed in these pages. The very witness publicly cited by Dr. Nevin to sustain his scheme, feels it his duty, at a meeting held before the eyes of the whole world, to call it a "foul stream." If that Alliance represented the general views of the whole Protestant world, then one may say that it stands condemned by the judgment of the Protestant world, and *especially* by the modern Evangelical Theology of Germany. It has been weighed in the balance, and been found wanting. Let us congratulate ourselves, that the Reformed church has been saved, (even though as by fire) from *endorsing* such a movement. The stream is not clear and pure, like the rill that issued from the glorious Reformation of the 16th century. It is muddy, intermixed with Romish errors. It is "another gospel" as Dr. Nevin himself announced. And yet it is but "a dwarfish, inconsistent copy" of the modern Romish church. So Wolff, and Ermentrout and Wagner, and Forney, felt it to be.

This caps the climax of Dorner's delineation. After this we feel as if the curtain should fall. A "dwarfish" copy, an "inconsistent" copy, of the Romish church!

After all, then, the American opponents of Nevinism have been *right*: their judgment has been confirmed, fully, by no less a man than Prof. Dorner.\*

J. H. G.

\*There is one thing that has always been perfectly unaccountable to us. Dr. Nevin has been supposed to be thoroughly acquainted with German Theology, and most of the men of

## DR. SCHNECK'S BOOK ON MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY.

Dr. Benjamin S. Schneck, widely known and beloved throughout the length and breadth of the Reformed church, as a conservative, calm and candid man, and for many years editor of the *Messenger*, has written a book to show that Mercersburg Theology is inconsistent with Protestant and Reformed doctrine, as held by the Reformed church in Europe and America. It contains nearly 200 pages, takes up the most important doctrines in order, shows from proper authorities what the Reformed church has always held, and then demonstrates, fortified by proper extracts, that the Mercersburg movement has departed so widely from these doctrines, that it may in truth be said, that the system as a whole *is inconsistent* with the standards and the faith of the Reformed church.

Dr. Schneck was well qualified to undertake this task, which, to one of his sensitive mind must have been not a little disagreeable. He has been fully acquainted with the Mercersburg movement since it first commenced in the Reformed church. He has seen it grow from its earliest utterances as a mere speculation, until it has become a powerful, compact and overbearing heresy in the church. Well read in German Theology, he has known from the start, how false have been its pretensions to be in harmony with the modern Evangelical Theology of Germany. His visit to Germany many years ago, to induce Dr. Krummacher to accept a call to Mercersburg, made him personally acquainted with many leading Reformed clergymen of the continent. Well grounded in the

the Mercersburg School talk as if they were thoroughly acquainted with it. Many things indicate that they have *assumed* to possess a knowledge which they did not have in fact. We cannot think that they were dishonest in this; but that they trusted too much in Dr. Nevin's representations, thinking that he *could not possibly be* mistaken. But he has been mistaken.

1. He appealed to *Dorner*, as sustaining him, and we see now that Dorner regards his system as unprotestant.

2. So he appealed to *Ullman*, but Dorner has said that Nevin did not understand Ullman correctly.

3. So on the subject of Baptism, appeal was made to *De Presensee* as endorsing the Mercersburg view. We have read this author to some extent, and cannot find anything of the kind. There must have been a *mistake* in this also.

4. So in Miller's book, and in the *Messenger*, dozens of times, it was claimed that the modern Evangelical Theology of Germany was in *full accord* with Mercersburg. All a mistake. But how did they come to make *such* wild assertions? Was it not because they had no personal and actual knowledge of this Theology, but merely said so on the authority of some one? If Dr. Nevin misled them, why did he not correct them?



*Dr. Schneck's Book on Mercersburg Theology.* 139

German genius and spirit of our church, he has been qualified to criticise this movement on its own ground. And, best of all, well grounded in the Theology of the Heidelberg Catechism and other Reformed Confessions, he has been able to see how wide a departure it is from sound, orthodox, scriptural, Reformed doctrine.

That many younger ministers, who have been educated in this system alone, and who have never come to understand the *historical genius* of our church, should believe that the Mercersburg doctrine is really and genuinely Reformed, perhaps need not to be wondered at. They are no doubt honest. Such should read this book, ponder and reflect, and compare, and see whether this aged and experienced man is not right. The book bears internal evidence that he aimed and intended to be right and just.

In this book, now, we have a pretty full discussion of *the whole subject*. It is well that all the threads of the discussion have here been brought together into one book, with the proper extracts bearing on both sides, so that every intelligent person can weigh both sides, and come to an independent judgment in the matter.

Therefore, every member of the Reformed church should obtain this book, and carefully and prayerfully study it. It is published in the English and German languages.

It is written *for the people of the church*, and is addressed to their calm judgment. It is plain, concise, candid, irenic in spirit, pervaded by a deep love for the church, and for her old and well tried faith. It is thorough, and we think convincing. We think no impartial and candid mind can rise from its perusal without a clear conviction that this Mercersburg system is unsound in its basis, built up on mere assertions without satisfactory proof, and dangerous in its tendencies.

This book will have great weight with many minds, we think. It deserves to have it. Although it does not pretend to go into a deep theological discussion of the doctrines brought under review, yet it is by no means superficial. We should not greatly wonder if it would create quite a sensation. Dr. Schneck has hitherto taken no part in this controversy. He has been content to look on—to observe and see whither all this so-called philosophical speculation would lead in the end. But he has seen young ministers (one of them *a nephew* and the son of an honored minister) perverted to Romanism; he has seen churches dis-

tracted, and the minds of Christians confused in respect to the Gospel; he has seen the church, as a whole, convulsed with a controversy, thrust upon her without cause or occasion. He would have preferred to remain silent unto the end. But a stern sense of duty has compelled him to speak out. And he has spoken, what we regard as a *powerful word*—a word that *will be* heard, both for the sake of the speaker and for the sake of its own value and importance. We hope, too, that this word, spoken in all earnestness and love, will be heeded.

Dr. Schneck takes up a number of the leading doctrines, in proper order and connection. Every reader can thus obtain a good view of the whole Mercersburg scheme, one part of the work casting a great light upon other parts. Very properly, he first takes up the doctrine of the "atonement," and draws attention to the fact that, in order to hold their incarnation theory (which is merely subjective—a theory without Scriptural or historical support), they are compelled to *deny* (that is really the proper word) the doctrine of the atonement, as set forth by the Heidelberg Catechism; that they are compelled to explain away its plain meaning, as it stands in the Catechism; and that they openly "refuse" to believe that it means what it appears to mean. Starting from this central soteriological doctrine, he successively considers "Justification by Faith," "Ministers as Priests," "The Sacraments," "Ritualism." We must candidly say, that we think he very conclusively shows that the doctrines, as held and expounded by the Mercersburg school, *are really inconsistent*, to say the least, with the standards and teaching of the Reformed church in Europe and America. In our opinion, he has fully proven this, not by high-sounding generalities, but by clear and convincing proofs, drawn from the proper sources on both sides. If Dr. Schneck is wrong on any point, we have failed to see it. If he is in error, and does not understand what Reformed doctrine is, we hope this will be made clear by a competent hand. We suppose no one will pretend that he is a "Puritan," "rationalist," or "ignoramus."

There are many members of the church who have read a little here and there concerning this new system, that has come in with such high claims to depth and originality, but who have never obtained a reasonably full conception of the real meaning and character of its teachings. Let them read this book carefully.



*Dr. Schneck's Book on Mercersburg Theology.* 141

They will learn to understand this system more fully; and they will also learn to comprehend all the better the plain, comforting, Scriptural faith of our fathers, which has really been "a comfort" to thousands, in life and death. Let us deliver that, unchanged, to our children and children's children.

The reader will find in this book very much that is exceedingly interesting, to which we cannot more fully refer at this time.

J. H. G.

[In addition to the preceding notice of Dr. Schneck's book, the following has been received, and serves to confirm the statements of the writer of that notice. Our own remarks on the subject are reserved for the *Editor's Desk*.—ED.]

SCHNECK ON MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY.

SCHNECK on Mercersburg Theology. This is the title of a book published by J. B. Lippincott & Co., who know how to get out a book to please the eye. I have read and re-read its pages with no little degree of interest. The statements are so sadly true. It is a clear exposure of the wide departure of the advocates of Mercersburg theology from the teachings of the fathers of the Reformed church. No man in our church, or outside of it, could do the work better. How the leaders of the falsely-styled philosophical theology can tarry any longer in the Reformed church, is hard to understand. If the indictment by the gentle doctrine in his book is true, *and we believe it is*, they are the most audacious promulgators of innovating doctrines that ever appeared in any church of the same type like the Reformed. They lack moral courage to go where they belong, and where their hearts are. It is evident, beyond contradiction, that they have no love for the *faith* and *practice* of the Reformed church. The book is opportune. The people are prepared for it. It is just what they want. It reveals truths that cannot be denied. We knew them long ago, and did all in our power to have the people understand the true nature of the troubles in our Zion.

The feelings of not a few of the readers of the *Messenger* have been outraged, for a number of years, by some of its writers: never more than when Dr. Apple's article appeared, relative to the precious doctrine of the atonement, as distinctly taught in our Catechism.

Any one who can sit down and read "the facts" in the book, and still sustain Mercersburg theology, is ready to divide the Reformed church from north to south, and from east to west. It is, indeed, becoming very evident that the leaders, and some of their disciples, are getting ready, as fast as they can, for division. And, another thing, we have every reason to believe that there is a "secret society" organized for a purpose within the pales of our church. Do all the Mercersburg men deny it?

The style of the book is attractive. No one can help being pleased with it in this respect. Thanks to dear Brother Schneck for writing it; and how shall we express our gratitude to the Most High for its seasonable appearance. The invectives of the Mercersburg pens mean nothing when God's hand is at work.

The book, the doctor modestly says, is for the people, and, we add, also for the ministry, especially the younger portion, many of whom are infatuated with a theological bubble long ago exploded in the Roman Catholic church. It is written for the people, and the clergy are a part of them. Let all buy the book, read it, and not only read it, but study it.

The *letter*, instead of a preface, is worth the price of the book itself. The author of that letter is not the only one who has to repent for endorsing the Nevinite theory. The writer of this article also at one time tried to defend it. Never will our confidence in it be restored. It has been weighed, and found wanting. Their theory is worthless. We tested it for years by the Scriptures, and such standard writers of the Protestant Reformed church as we could command. They are mistaken if they indulge the hope of ever succeeding with the theory in the Reformed church. No, never.

LORENZO PASTOR.

---

#### HAS IT COME TO THIS?

O. "I hear you intend getting some copies of Dr. Schnecks's book on shortly, and that you are going to get some for MY members."

X. "No, "brother," none for your people, although two of them asked me this morning when the book would be out (which I could not tell them) and then they requested me to order them each a copy,



*but I told them they had better write for themselves and get the copies."*

O. *"I tell you if you sell a copy of it to any of MY members, I will prefer charges against you or any other minister, before our classis."*

This is the substance of a dialogue that recently passed between Rev. X., a minister of the Reformed church and Dr. O., a Mercersburg Ritualistic minister, on the street. It is certainly noteworthy, and affords the uninitiated an idea of the meat these new Drs. of Mercersburg are fed upon. No one can fully appreciate this priestly arrogance who has never been in Papal Ireland—in Italy before the Revolution, or in priest-ridden Mexico. To any one who recognizes this Dr., and who can picture him as he talked of "*my members*," and the terror that clothed his capacious brow as he threatened timid, gentle Brother X, with the thunder of terrible charges, this street scene were perfectly ridiculous, did not indignation supplant that feeling. Has it come to this that not a thousand miles from where this is written, among a christian people, a *man* should dare play such a fantastic trick as this before high heaven. It is certainly an exhibition of very ugly human nature, which it had been politic to hide from the public gaze. May be it is only the new and peculiar phase that it is made to assume by the new order of things introduced into the church life at Mercersburg? If it be so, the old is better; and as it set forth Christ and was a witness for him, it did more to glorify the Saviour. It also sets forth the character of the training for the work of the *Holy* ministry that does not reflect much credit on its source. As was predicted and feared, this is the manner of spirit that the Mercersburg teaching engenders. It is the legitimate and proper fruit produced by that seed sown while the confiding Reformed church slept.

It is further evidence of the degree of dread with which the book of Dr. Schneck has filled the souls of the new-order giants, The minds of *their* members have been seduced from the truth, and their understandings bewildered, and they resist with the frenzy of despair the entrance of light among their churches. It really amounts to the interdict of a small Pope—*less* than the "duodecimo" size. We can scarcely conceive that the sale of the Bible would be resisted with more heat in their congregations than is this unpretending small volume. It has been the policy of

errorists, when argument failed them, to launch bulls and curses at those whose truths they opposed and hated.

It is to be hoped that those two of "my members" who were seeking light—hungering for the old Reformed faith, were not deterred by the interdicts of Dr. O., and are now safe in the ownership of the coveted volume; and not having the fear of the redoubtable small Dr. before their eyes, have read it, and that it has done them good. Has it come to this, that a people whom Christ has made free, shall be denied the right to elect what they shall read—that a minister of Jesus Christ dare not, under the penalty of having charges preferred against him, comply with the request of a christian friend to procure for him a book that he desires to read. Is this in the free United States, and in the year of grace, 1874? We trust that the friends of Dr. Schneck's book will scatter it broadcast over the church—that despite all charges and anathemas, every man, woman and child, willing to read it, may be able to get a copy, and that "my members" may not fail to obtain the coveted volume.

ARNAULD.

---

#### AN ALLEGORY.

MR. EDITOR: One of the best things yet written on the Mercersburg Aberration, is the following quaint Allegory by the "Fisherman," which we find in the "Christian World." It is so good that it deserves to be preserved in the *Monthly*. O.

*"Reformirte Saurteig" in the Reformed Church.*

While I was at New Philadelphia, O., engaged in looking after "old fish," I had the pleasure of meeting my old friend, Rev. P. Greding, our ex-German professor at Heidelberg College, and editor of the *Evangelist*, published at Cleveland, O. He was busy in his study, writing for that paper, ably defending the "Echt Reformirte Lehr." He is not timid or afraid to speak out on the church question and expose the dangerous "Reformirte Saurteig," or Reformed leaven.

"Well," says one, "we need leaven, or 'sour dough,' to make



nice light bread. Every experienced baker and housewife tries to procure good 'yeast,' in order to make light bread."

No complaint had been lodged on the part of our Reformed family, either in Europe or America, against the old-fashioned "Heidelberg Bread," which had been the spiritual staff of life of our people for three hundred years. It was not until this new "Development" bakery was erected at Mercersburg (now at Lancaster, Pa.), that an improvement in this theological breadmaking was thought of.

The question now might be asked, What were the reasons for introducing this new order of things?

It came on this wise: The head-baker at Mercersburg was considered a scientific man, and by means of his powerful high-church microscope, he thought he could discover a wee bit of Puritanic mold in the old leaven. Besides this, he said it was also tainted with a little *Methodism*. This he could discover with his olfactory nerves. Some of his young bakers were also invited to smell at the old leaven, and look through this new glass and examine the Heidelberg yeast.

Now, it came to pass when our Mercersburg and Lancaster bakers began to import foreign "sauerteig" (leaven), and mixed it with the old Heidelberg meal in the "Reformed dough-tray," the result was, the yeast got so *frothy*, and at sundry times the leaven got so foamy, that it worked over and ran out of the Heidelberg tray, and was caught up in the Episcopal and Roman bread-pans. This sad calamity had previously been predicted by our Heidelberg and Ursinus Doctors of Divinity.

This "new-order" of things has caused considerable excitement in the camp of Israel, between our theological bakers (Tiffin and Ursinus), on the one hand, and Lancaster and Mercersburg on the other. The latter party want to improve the Evangelical bread, by developing the old leaven; while the former protest against introducing, adding or mixing any foreign or imported substance in the old Reformed meal.

This loss was a sad calamity to our "Reformed Bakery," and, with the best wishes of our L. and M. bakers, there is no way to redeem this spilt dough. It is gone. It is now thought by some that this will be a good warning, and that in the future they will be more careful and not tamper with the old Heidelberg yeast, and not mix any more imported "Satz."

But just here comes in the difficulty. The L. and M. theological bakers deny the charge. They say they are not to blame for this loss. But they affirm and declare that these six, or eight, or more loaves, which foamed over into the Episcopal and Roman pans, was not caused by the new Mercersburg and Lancaster development leaven, but "worked over of itself." "Des is en wunner-volle ursach," *i. e.*, "This is a wonderful reason." H. L.

BASIL, O.

---

#### THE AWAKENING IN EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

AN interesting letter from the Rev. Dr. William Arnot, in the last number of the *Christian Weekly*, fully confirms the previous accounts of the great religious awakening in Edinburgh and its vicinity. He speaks with discriminating appreciation of the "unquenching zeal and indomitable perseverance of Mr. Moody, whose power as an 'instrument of righteousness' lies in this, that he is on fire himself, and kindles those with whom he comes in contact." The doctrines which he preaches are of the old-fashioned evangelical type, so long familiar in Scotland. "The difference lies in the application rather than in the development of the Gospel." Dr. Arnot adds, that the blessing has rested mainly on "the close personal dealing." "Sinners are lovingly, yet forcibly, brought face to face with a beseeching Saviour, so that they cannot escape, as they have been wont, to the right or to the left." And while there are some things "in the manipulations to which inquirers have been subjected," which he thinks "overdone," yet he says, "I never dared to object in word, or even thought, to the methods of men who were in earnest about their work, and much more successful than I had ever been."

Mr. Sankey's "tender, powerful, articulate singing has been, to a large extent, a means of grace. It has drawn many within the reach of a preached gospel. It has contributed, along with the preaching, to soften and move prodigal hearts, and it has enlivened many disciples, so that they tread the path with lighter step and blither look than before." In addition to the crowded gatherings on Sabbath and at the daily prayer-meetings, "many spe-



*The Awakening in Edinburgh and London.* 147

cial meetings have been held—of mothers from the poorer districts, of young men, of students of the university—and when Mr. Moody is expected, the hall is always crowded, whether it be at nine in the morning or nine at night.”

Most of the British evangelical periodicals speak with deep interest and hearty approval of this great work. The most notable exception is the *Christian World*, of London, which, in its issue of January 23d, in a long depreciatory editorial, entitled “Religious Excitement,” throws cold water on the whole movement; and in a contributed article says that the question, “Do we need a revival?” has been treated “in a manner and with a frequency which have been at once wearisome and offensive.”

But simultaneously the revival spirit has come in the East End of London. A universal exchange of pulpits was proposed at a meeting of two hundred evangelical pastors and officials, of different denominations, on the second Sunday morning and evening in January. It was arranged that no bill should be “printed to say who is coming,” and that all the sermons preached that day should be “purely evangelistic, every brother seeking the salvation of souls.” A “monster prayer-meeting” was held on the Saturday evening previous in the East London Tabernacle, and the exchange on Sabbath took place in fifty Nonconformist pulpits, in which the one great theme was—“O Lord! revive Thy work.”

The exercises of the Week of Prayer in St. James’ Hall, Willis’ Rooms, the “London Tavern,” and other places, were also attended by immense assemblies, and were characterized by the same deep spiritual feeling. It is too soon to ascertain the results of these awakenings of religious interest in London. But it looks very much as if the edge of the great tidal wave which has overwhelmed the Scotch metropolis had touched the British capital.

---

A YOUNG Japanese nobleman, who went about a year ago to the University at Michigan, attended service at church through curiosity, but soon became deeply interested for the salvation of his soul. He has recently been baptized.

## Arsinus College Repertory.

THE first pages of the *Repertory* are most cheerfully devoted to the other two addresses delivered at the last anniversary of the Schaff Literary Society, one by Mr. Tice, of Myerstown, Lebanon county, the other by Mr. Ebbert, of Bedford county, Pa.

### THE GOLDEN RULE.

RELIGION is often measured by state lines, and regulated by statute law. The Christianity which is lawful on one side of a mountain, or stream, or an imaginary line, is punished with confiscation, imprisonment or death on the other side. Does God require this at the hands of one portion of His children towards the other portion, their brethren? Has He instituted such laws, and does He inflict such punishments for difference of opinion? Then, if we take into consideration all the religions in the world, how much greater will be the intolerance? There are three great religions in the world, which recognize the one, only living and true God—Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism. But all differ in their faith. Each pretends to have the true faith, and consequently rejects the others. Faith depends *greatly* on our education. If we were instructed by the Mohammedans, we would certainly approve of their faith; or by the Catholics, we would believe them to have the right faith. If this be true, none dare molest or condemn either.

And this reminds us that to the highest interest of man we are to apply the Golden Rule. All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.

Man, born in sin, is naturally inclined to take advantage of his fellow-men. He thinks of himself before any other person. He is not aware that his Creator placed him in this world to assist his neighbor, and receive his assistance in return. Act not from selfishness or injustice, but put yourself in the place of the other,



and ask what you would expect of him then. This would make you impartial, and candid, and just. It would destroy avarice, envy, treachery, and every other in crime's dark list. It has been well said that this law is what the balance-wheel is to a machinery. It would prevent all unequal motion in the moral world, as that does in a steam engine.

The Golden Rule is and includes the sum and substance of the Old Testament.

It is nowhere found in so many words, but it is a summary expression of all that the law required.

All are entitled to the rights which each one claims for himself. All are equal, all are brethren—owning one origin, one nature, one destiny. Living the same life, one interest thrills alike in every heart. If our brother suffer, we feel his anguish; if he prosper, we share his joy. The pains and woes of each swell the common tide of humanity's evils, in which we have an equal share and a lot. It is the temper of a Christian constantly to act towards his fellow-creatures with justice. Has Providence placed him in some office, as Judge, Senator, or some other public office? He will vigorously oppose oppression, and punish the oppressor; he will be active to put laws in execution, to establish tranquillity and promote peace; he is conscious of God, the author of all civil government, to whom every one entrusted with the discharge of any part of it stands as strictly accountable as the servant to his lord. "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor."

Has he riches in such abundance as to create numerous dependents? He will exercise Christian justice towards them all; he will not require the last farthing his estate can produce; but he will reward his subjects for their faithfulness.

We shall owe no man anything, but to love one another. The opposite practice, not punishable in the rich by human laws, except in extreme cases, is an abhorrence to God, and falls under His displeasure. If we are engaged in trade or merchandise, then the energy of our Christian principles will show itself in a still stronger light. If we are true followers of Christ, we will not suffer the love of money to bias or corrupt our conscience. We will not take advantage either of the ignorance or the necessity of those dealing with us, put a bad thing into their hands for a good,

or ask more for it than its real value. Now, if any one were to say it is not possible to live honestly and deal conscientiously among those that have no conscience, I answer, that violent as the temptation may be, we must not give way to injustice, but go forward with justice in our hands, opposing the wrong and upholding the right. If we have any true respect for Christianity, we must be punctually just and righteous in all our dealings. We know that God requires us to be honest. He leaves no foundation for taking advantage of our fellow-men. Thus saith the Lord, the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights—a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thine house divers measures—a great and a small. But thou shalt have a perfect and a just weight—a perfect and a just measure shalt thou have—that thy days may be lengthened in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. For all that do such things, and all that do unrighteously, are an abomination unto the Lord thy God." Shall we say, then, that men offer their honesty in the market, as they offer their skill, and are paid for the one as the other? No; their skill has been acquired to sell, and for no other reason; but their honesty, if it be genuine, has another basis altogether; and he who is honest, simply because honesty is the best policy, is not honest at all! The very characteristic of honesty is, that it cannot be bought. It has a moral and not a mercantile foundation. Besides, the Lord that bought us with His own precious blood, and from whose grace alone we expect the gift of salvation, has commanded us to conform in our whole conduct to the following rule:

"Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do unto them; for this is the law and the prophets."

When we are in the bustle of life, and perform its urgent duties, and our truthfulness is fairly tested, where shall we seek refuge to shield ourselves, and which shall impart true light on our minds and souls? We must not pause and ask what the wisest would do, because they have never found this gem: "All things that ye would men should do unto you, do ye even so to them."

Impressing this rule on our minds, and making it our course of life, peace and joy will be our lot. No strife or discord will enter our midst. No difference of opinions will disturb our peace, as it does at the present day.



How often is the Golden Rule, and properly so called, trampled under foot, especially by those whom God has ordained to declare His laws to every living soul? How can such advocates expect this rule to bring about good results, if they themselves are at enmity with one another, and inculcate bad principles into the minds of their disciples?

The Golden Rule should find a ready response in every conscience. All will assent to its rightfulness and its importance. Let us, then, not cease its practice while we urge the reasons for our faith. On it let us all unite in furthering the mission of Christianity, till man everywhere shall behold in every fellow-man a brother; till all shall realize that sin is the worst evil, and hatred the worst sin, to individuals and to the race; till mankind shall indeed be one family, and one great law, the law of love, shall bind continents, isles and nations in one community. May this rule, the Golden Rule, be written on the tablet of each one's heart here to-night; and may He who loveth us all keep it there forever.

A. M. T.

---

#### THE CENTENNIAL.

It is right that nations should celebrate their great achievements, and keep them in grateful remembrance.

The American people celebrate the Fourth of July, because it is the birth-day of their liberties—the day on which the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed from Independence Hall—the day on which our ancestors threw off the yoke of British injustice, and trampled it under foot.

The origin of our nation is to be traced chiefly to the Pilgrim Fathers, who, on account of the religious oppressions of England, left their native land, and set sail to seek a home where they might worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. This small body inaugurated a principle of government by which the fetters of tyranny have been broken. Here was assumed, for the first time, the grand principle of a voluntary confederacy of independent men instituting a government for the good, *not of the governors, but of the governed*. No pleasant homes

were here to welcome them ; no friends to greet them ; none to salute them ; but starvation, the scalping-knife of the savage, and the howling beast of the forest stared them in the face. They toiled hard for sustenance. During the day the savage assailed them, and at night he stopped not the tide of destruction. The ferocious beast of the forest, in his midnight prowling, passed them not by. It seemed that they had come but to meet a worse fate ; yet they prospered and increased in wealth and numbers, in spite of adversity. These difficulties, privations and trials were considered secondary, when compared with the blessings of freedom of conscience and freedom of thought.

As time rolls on, we learn that England claimed the right to tax America, without allowing her representation in Parliament. This action of the mother country roused the indignation of a people long insulted. The colonists petitioned, remonstrated and protested, but to no purpose ; for the more they petitioned, remonstrated and protested, the more loudly Parliament declared, "*Ye shall be slaves.*"

This gave rise to the Revolutionary War. The colonies of America (thirteen in number) united in defense and in vindication of their rights. They struggled against tyranny on the battle-field. Many privations did they suffer from the time of the battle of Lexington to the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. The same unseen hand that protected the Pilgrims, guided Washington and his compatriots through the Revolution. Many hard-fought battles are recorded on the pages of history—as those of Bunker Hill, Trenton, Monmouth, Saratoga and Yorktown.

During the course of the war the Fourth of July, 1776, dawns, when Columbia manfully sunders the fetters of tyranny, and "stands free in her sovereignty, and bids her eagle spread his wings." Independence is now declared, amidst the ringing of bells and the exultations of thousands. When the Declaration is read to the weary, half-clad veterans, it is received by one prolonged shout, till it echoes and reëchoes throughout the camp. It animates them with new vigor. Henceforward each, with Adams, declares that, "live or die, survive or perish, I am for the Declaration."

The defeat of Cornwallis, at Yorktown, virtually ended the Revolution. England is now compelled to grant the blessings of an honorable peace to America. With the transaction of this



treaty, another nation commences its course, which, acknowledging the rights of the people, is founded on broad and liberal principles. No nation in Europe has been established without the sacrifice of thousands, and without usurpation. But we have found that the *powers* necessary to government *flow from the people*, and that the people should select the representatives to make the laws. Ours is a peculiar nation. We may truly affirm that no other nation possesses such natural advantages. The United States is fortified by oceans, has great rivers which lead far into the interior; an extensive soil, which is exceedingly productive; mountains, which are composed almost wholly of iron; vast coal fields, lead, copper, silver and gold. Empires are recorded, indeed, which extended over larger territories; but these were composed of nations which had been subdued. It is true, the United States has citizens representing every clime and language living on her soil; yet none have been compelled to immigrate hither; for all have left the Old World voluntarily, to enjoy with us our excellent inheritance.

Our national prosperity has been unusually rapid, not only in military and naval accomplishments, but also in science. Institutions of learning are established in every State. In addition, the system of public instruction has been instituted, by which millions are instructed. We have solved problems in political economy, in the solution of which other nations have failed. We enjoy the freedom of the press, so that all may express their views through this medium.

The late Civil War, so fresh in the memory as if but yesterday, by which so many noble men met their death, humiliated us at the time; but this humiliation gave forth a glorious victory in favor of our Federal Government. The Revolution gained us liberty and freedom; but the Civil War gave the death-blow to slavery—*a curse to any people.*

The nation, however, has been very successful, so that within a century she has become a power deserving the respect and the notice of other nations. In view of their prosperity, the people should celebrate the birth-day of their independence; and it is because of their great national prosperity that the Centennial has been proposed. "The Centennial bids fair to surpass any exhibition ever held. The Ludi Sæculares of the Romans hardly warrant a comparison. The improvements in all the industrial

departments, from the discovery of America by Columbus to the present time, will be displayed. It is hoped that all the empires and all the kingdoms of the Old World will be represented. The tendency of the Centennial will be to create a still more intimate relation between the powers of the Old World and the power of the New World. The result will be to bind the American people more closely to their first principles—Liberty and Union—and to cause them to acknowledge the wisdom and goodness of the Creator.

“Lord of the universe! shield us and guide us!  
 Trusting Thee always, through shadow and sun;  
 Thou hast united us, who shall divide us?  
 Keep us, O keep us, the *many in one*!  
 Up with our banner bright,  
 Sprinkled with starry light.  
 Spread its fair emblems from mountain to shore;  
 While through the sounding sky,  
 Loud rings the nation's cry—  
*Union and Liberty! one evermore!*”

D. W. E.

---

#### CURRENT ITEMS.

A KNIGHT-ERRANT *of the pretentious science (!) of phrenology* managed, by dint of extensive endorsements representing him as something extraordinary, even for a Scotchman, in his line, and as advocating a theory “quite above materialistic craniology, to get a hearing, recently, before Ursinus. But two efforts seemed quite to exhaust the Professor's (!) fund of philosophy, and more than exhausted the College fund of patience. So the Lecturer (otherwise a right clever sort of gentleman) was allowed to proceed on his mission.

THE *Zwinglian Literary Society* will celebrate its *fourth Anniversary* on Thursday Evening, *March 26, 1874*. The exercise will be chiefly of a literary character. The following gentlemen have been chosen to represent the Society on the occasion, viz: Salutory, C. H. Ash; Oration, S. M. Hench; Oration, R. W.



Weirbach; Oration, E. G. Williams; Oration, G. A. Scheer; Anniversary Oration, A. E. Dahlman.

The exercises will be interspersed with appropriate music by the Germania Orchestra, of Pottstown, Pa. A cordial invitation is extended to all.

THE NEXT COMMENCEMENT.—Although it seems premature to talk about an occasion still so far distant, still as it is done in other cases, we may be justified in ringing our bell a little, by way of timely premonition to prepare for what promises to be, and may easily be made, a most interesting event. Let all the friends of Ursinus keep the date, Wednesday and Thursday, June 24 and 25, steadily in mind, and, as far as may be, shape their engagements so as to be here. The large number from abroad who favored the last Commencement with their presence, were so much gratified, that most of them will doubtless endeavor to repeat the pleasure. And we hope that their good report of what they saw, heard and enjoyed, will induce many more to join them in the festivities of the occasion.

Besides the usual exercises of the Commencement proper, there will be an Anniversary Address; the *Rev. D. E. Klopp*, A.M., being the chosen orator of the day. In addition to this there will, we presume, be a reunion of the *Alumni*, to welcome into the Association the next graduating class. The *Ursinus Union* will also hold its annual meeting for mutual greetings, and to transact such business as may claim its attention in the interests of the Institution. Altogether, there will be abundant attractions, which will not fail to draw large numbers to our halls, and make the season even more memorable than the Commencement of 1873.

HEIDELBERG COLLEGE, Tiffin, Ohio, as we rejoice to learn, is progressing prosperously with its work, and richly merits the liberal support especially of that portion of the Reformed church in the midst of which it is located. It deserves, and should promptly receive, all the aid it needs to prosecute its important mission.

THE *Sheboygan Mission* Institute, at Howard's Grove, Wisconsin, is also flourishing, and proving an efficient source for supplying the German churches of the West with an earnest, devoted, and intelligent ministry.

COLLEGE AND EDUCATIONAL NOTES.—There are one hundred students in the State Agricultural College at Orono, Me.

*The* people of Indianapolis are moving for a University in that city that shall be inferior to none in the country.

*The* Illinois House of Representatives has passed, by a large majority (87 to 43), a bill for compulsory education.

*The* University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., opened in 1868 with nine students, and now has two hundred and fifty-six.

*Governor Dix* has been appointed Honorary Chancellor of Union University for this year, the duty of which office lies in the giving an address before the university.

*At* the late semi-annual examination of the cadets of the Military Academy, at West Point, comprising the first, second, and third classes, but one failed to pass—a third class man.

*Bishop Pierce* recently stated authoritatively, that Emory College, Georgia, would soon have an endowment of half a million of dollars from a source which he did not feel at liberty to reveal.

*Kozo Suguria*, who was formerly a student at Rutgers College, has been made chief director of the Imperial College at Tokei, Japan; and also superintendent of the School of Foreign Languages.

*The* University of California propose to maintain a botanical garden, in which such rare plants as will grow in that climate may be cultivated. The nurserymen of the State have generally offered to contribute some of their choicest specimens.

*The* students of the Massachusetts Agricultural College are said to have been greatly interested in the study of botany and in making preparation for planting the Massachusetts garden, which is to contain all the indigenous and naturalized plants of that State.

*Fifty-one* teachers have been employed in Harvard College during the past year, of whom twenty were professors, eight assistant professors, six tutors, twelve instructors, and five assistants. The great dining hall of the college, to accommodate five or six hundred students, will be finished by June next. Next year the university will have six fellowships, all of which have an income large enough to support a student, and four of which may be used either in this country or Europe.



## EDITORS' DESK.

*Renewed Thanks* to our friends for prompt payment of dues and efforts to increase the circulation of the MONTHLY. Let the work go on. It is not too late yet to get subscribers for the present year. Another hundred added to our list would give great encouragement. Who will help to secure them?

*Many cheering letters* continue to be received, from which we are strongly tempted to make a few extracts, as specimens of the tenor of all of them.

One writes: "I read the MONTHLY with interest and profit, and rejoice to know that the good cause which it supports is making progress."

Another says: "I pray with all my heart for God's blessing to rest upon it, and upon those who edit it."

Another wishes that "every member of the church would take and read it."

And, to add one more, a friend in the east writes: "I heartily approve the vigorous warfare for the pure truth. I am glad to see the MONTHLY standing so firmly in the breach, and contending against the assailants of Evangelical Protestantism on their own line."

*To several inquirers* we again reply, that all articles in the MONTHLY which have no signature attached to them, are from the senior editor's pen. The articles of contributors are always indicated by the initials of their names, or some other signature.

*Our friends must be cautioned* against sending money by letter. The only surely safe way is to transmit by *bank check* or *postal order*, on Philadelphia.

The postal order is the best and cheapest way. Checks on country banks cost us twenty-five cents for collection. This is rather too heavy a discount on two dollars.

READ the article on *Dr. Schneck's book*. Our own remarks on it will be found under *Book Notices*, which see. Orders for the book will be promptly filled.

TACKING AGAIN.—*Tacking*, our readers will remember, is a phrase, and an art in common use among *sailors*. When they want to take their vessel *against the wind*, instead of attempting to sail directly in its face, they *tack about*, from right to left, something like the letter Z, and so try to make headway in spite of the wind. In one sense, it is *cheating* the wind by seeming to yield to it, whilst at the same time the sailors are really keeping on in their course. Such tacking is, naturally, pretty hard work, and requires a good deal of skill. If the opposing wind is very strong there is great danger that, in shifting about, the ship may upset and all aboard go down.

Now, as we had occasion to say some time ago, there is such a thing as

*tacking in theology.* Theologians may take it into their heads to go out on a cruise of exploration after strange doctrines. Not satisfied with the faith of the church to which they belong, or, beguiled by some contrary faith, they may set sail for a new port. At first nobody may notice or suspect their design, or few may be willing to believe that they could be guilty of wishing and trying to take the vessel entrusted to them into a foreign and hostile harbor. Thus they may make considerable headway with little or no opposition. This emboldens them, and they reveal their scheme more plainly. The church discovers the real bearing of the movement. Strong and decided opposition to their attempt springs up. Instead of having the church with them, it becomes evident that the deep and settled convictions and feelings of the church are against them. Their loud profession of meaning it all right, their denunciation of those who have exposed the movement, as being slanderers, gross misrepresenters, &c., won't do. The church sees that the theologians, instead of going onward in the true course marked out in the chart, are carrying things in an evidently contrary direction. The church is not so blind but it can discern the difference between the road to Jerusalem and that to Gath of the Philistines, and it does not want its children to be taken to *Gath* but to Jerusalem, not to *Rome* but to *heaven*.

What shall the theologians do? Give up their scheme, abandon their mad and wicked attempt? But they do not think it wicked or mad. They say, and one may believe them so far, that their design is good, that they have gotten on the track of a better faith than that of the church, and more in the same strain. How, then, can they be expected, as honest men, to turn back? If they think Popery, excepting its infallibility, and old high-church Lutheranism better, in most essential points, than the faith of the Reformed church, they ought not to change their course, but go right on until they fully reach their chosen destination.

Yes, but they want to take the church with them; they love her so that they can't bear to think of leaving her to stand on the bleak rocks of "a metaphysical Calvinism" (this is one of their phrases,) and "gnostic pietism." Then, moreover, the church has a complete organization, all in working order, endowed institutions, with an investment of some \$300,000, (by far the largest part of which was given, it is true, by those who are most earnestly opposed to high-church Lutheranism, or to any thing like it,) to say nothing of ever so many churches (buildings,) all ready for use. Any one can easily understand that the theologians in question, honestly thinking themselves right, should wish to secure all these advantages in aid of their cause.

It cannot be done, however, openly and straight out. *The church will not go with them.* Wind and tide are strongly against them. What shall they do? TACK. That is, hold on to the ruling purpose, the main end in view. Do not abandon that. But shift the sails. Change the apparent course of the vessel. Yield somewhat to the pressure of the wind and current, for the time. Move zig-zag, or, if it can't be helped, go back a little and wait for a fairer breeze. In this way several advantages may, possibly, be gained. For instance, it may puzzle the very winds to know which way the vessel is steering. Or, it



may enable some to assert that its course has really been changed, that however much out of the way before, it is coming all right, and that therefore all alarm and fear regarding it should cease. Or others may seem to be justified in saying they knew that all would come right, and that the hue and cry raised about the movement was nothing but the working of spleen envy, and "disappointed ambition."

Illustrations of this *tacking artifice* have been given quite recently again.

Who would believe it, that Lancaster is beginning to speak somewhat respectfully and approvingly of the *Evangelical Alliance*! After all wrote against it in 1870, and after all the ill-concealed sarcastic allusions to it by other writers since, and even within six months, after ridiculing, as a "platform, over which evangelical theologians shake hands once a year," and after taking a stand in general, inimical to it in its constitution, creed and purposes, and doing this persistently for years, it is too late to come out with some reluctant concessions in its favor. The fact is, that Lancaster and its whole scheme is of a wholly, essentially different spirit from that of the Alliance.

It is true that Lancaster had a representative there. How it could accept the invitation under the circumstances is a riddle we shall not try to solve. But Lancaster is welcome to all the comfort it got, and all the honors it achieved by being there. One thing is certain, it must have felt itself in strange company when some of the leading papers were read, and have had anything but pleasing emotions excited by them. This, however, is a delicate topic, on which we do not care to say all that naturally suggests itself.

We may inform Lancaster, however, that it is very widely mistaken when it says that none but its own kin were asked to attend or to take part publicly in the Alliance. And we may further inform it, that if quite "a delegation" of Lancaster men were there, some of them were no way backward in betraying their utter lack of sympathy with the Alliance, or in even expressing their aversion to it. The less the Lancaster Faculty say about this the better.

It is the *tacking* process in the case, however, which most attracts notice. Lancaster finds that its impotent breath cannot blast the Alliance. Now, it would make some capital out of its *participation in the meeting*! Yes, Lancaster was at the last Evangelical Alliance. Not like Cæsar in Gaul (*veni, vidi, vici*), but like that other general of whom the facetious poet says—

The king with his ten thousand men,  
Went up the hill and came down again.

*The discussion about development* and pantheism is not to the taste of the Lancaster Faculty. So they retire from the arena. We shall probably not hear from them soon again on these points. The development pretensions are played out, and for their pantheising tendencies, they (the *Messenger* especially) wishe the matter hushed up.

*Foolish threats.* According to an incident reported by the writer of an article in the present number, it seems likely that some of the more zealous and overbearing partizans of Nevinism will try to prevent the circulation of Dr. Schneck's

book by threats of ecclesiastical prosecution. This seems too ridiculous to be thought possible. And yet, judging from some things which have been done by that party in the past, it seems quite likely that some of them would not stop at such an attempt, if, on consulting with a few sympathisers, they hoped to get the support of a Classis or Synod. Such a measure was really talked of, to our great amusement, when we started the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY. That some earnest was meant, appears from the action which the Danville Synod was led to take in our case.

Our friends, however, need not be told their rights in all such matters, their rights as citizens, as Christians, and as members of the Reformed church; and we feel sure that all will have courage very calmly and resolutely to assert and exercise their rights.

It may be, and doubtless is, altogether in harmony with the Popish principles of Mercersburg theology, to claim that ministers and pastors, being priests in a Romish sense, have full authority to allow or forbid things in their congregations and charges, just as they please. If such are their principles and convictions, they ought to carry them out.

But let all our truly Reformed ministers and members hold firmly to their rights and liberty in this respect. It is their undoubted right to aid in the circulation of all books not contrary to the doctrines of the Bible and the church, and especially books in defence of both, when, where, and to whom they please. No pastor has any right to forbid this. He may discourage the sale of the book, warn his people against it, denounce it, as much as he pleases. But he has no authority to say, you shall not circulate it here; if you do I will prosecute you.

For our own part, we give full, fair notice that we shall use all lawful means, by personal effort, by employing special agents, by letters to individuals, &c., to secure the widest possible circulation of Dr. Schneck's book, and any other book we believe calculated to do good. If the professors of our seminary could commend such a book as *Moehler's Symbolik*, shall we be forbidden to aid in spreading this truly Reformed book of Dr. S.'s, and that at a time when it is so much needed?

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

*Mercersburg Theology Inconsistent with Protestant and Reformed Doctrine.* By B. S. Schneck, D.D. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co.

To the extended notices of this timely volume, found on previous pages of this number of the MONTHLY, we desire to add our full endorsement, and a few further statements.

Since the removal of the Eastern Synod's institutions to Lancaster, the term, "*Mercersburg theology*," may not seem altogether appropriate, and may somewhat mislead those not acquainted with the movement. The theology, or



theological and philosophical speculators meant, is called *Mercersburg*, because those who started them, and who still maintain them, resided there at that time, in connection with the institutions named. When the removal to Lancaster took place, the old name was still retained for the *Review*, which the party publishes, and so continues to be applied to their peculiar views. Although, therefore, the theology in question is chiefly represented by persons in Lancaster, and is, strictly speaking, Lancaster theology, the old designation *Mercersburg* is used. It is well to remember this fact, as another school, called *Mercersburg College* has been established in Mercersburg on the ashes of the old, and in its ritualistic, high-church spirit, perhaps somewhat grotesquely intensified.

Never had the true members of any church, faithfully adhering to the doctrines and principles of that church, and from the deepest convictions of their being Scriptural and fundamental to Apostolic Christianity, better or stronger reasons for exposing and opposing a new movement than Dr. Schneck and those agreeing with him have for resisting Mercersburg theology. Altogether, it is one of the most audacious and revolutionary schemes ever devised or attempted in any church. It was started by what may be fairly called foreign influences, invited into the church when they professed and seemed to be, and probably were, in full harmony with the life, spirit, principles and faith of the church. Those influences, however, had not long gained a firm footing, and acquired strength and power, before unsettled, erratic tendencies began to manifest themselves. For a time they appeared to move, in the main, in a direction that promised advantages to the church. Thus, many who saw no further, suspected no serious danger, and had entire personal confidence in the judgment, intelligence, orthodoxy, and avowed aims of the leaders in the movement, were drawn along by it, and willingly went with it, though occasionally expressing doubts and dissent from some things said and done.

The movement thus started gradually widened its sweep, more and more openly betrayed its false bearings, directly or indirectly began to undermine the very foundations of Protestant Evangelical Christianity, and to plead for some of the worst errors of Popery, until it was positively asserted that one of its chief leaders was on the point of apostatising to the Romish church. Dr. Schneck refers to this painful fact in his book. For some reason or reasons not known publicly, the apostasy did not take place, and there seemed, for a season, to be a lull at least in the vigorous, open prosecution of the work begun. It was not long, however, before fresh courage was taken, and for some years past the scheme has been pressed forward with untiring energy and unhesitating effrontery.

No one must think that the movement has anything in it really resembling the *reformation* of the sixteenth century. It differs totally from that blessed movement in many respects.

First, there was a loud call and a deep necessity for the reformation in the fact that the ruling church of that age had become utterly corrupt in its faith and practice. It had apostatized from the very Gospel which it confessed to be the inspired word of God, and the ultimate highest rule of faith and life.

No Mercersburg man, or Nevinite, will dare to say that there has been, or is any such defection or apostasy in the Reformed church.

*Next*, the reformation was begun and carried on in an *open, frank* way; its aims and plans were *not concealed, disguised, denied* by those raised up as leaders in the great work. They openly denounced certain doctrines held to be fundamental by the Romish church, as contrary to the Scriptures, and fearlessly assailed them as false and pernicious. Luther and Zwingli never pretended that all they meant and wished was to develop Popery in full harmony with its own principles, and to carry out those principles to a more profoundly philosophical result. And everybody, even Rome, well understood those earnest, honest and brave men.

*Third*, the reformation sprang out of a very deep conviction in the minds and hearts of many thousands in all parts of Christendom, who, without perhaps fully understanding the nature and extent of evils of Popery, felt that there was something radically wrong, and needing a radical remedy.\* The leading Reformers were, therefore, merely the organs or instruments through whom those feelings and convictions found definite utterance, and a means of securing the desired relief.

Mercersburg theology sprang from one, or two or three minds, and has sought to insinuate and spread itself through the church. The church did not dream of such a movement, and has shown most clearly that the movement has no sympathy in the church, receives no hearty response from the church! The whole power of the movement is confined to the trained disciples of the school.

*Once more*, the reformation was not the work of the vain philosophical speculators or theological dreamers, but an earnest, practical movement from first to last. Hence, when the leading reformers wrote and preached to the people, "the people heard them gladly," knowing what they meant. And this was in an age when the common mind had been designedly held in the bondage of spiritual ignorance.

How ludicrously, not to say painfully, does the Mercersburg movement contrast with the Reformation in this respect.

*Finally*, the reformation earnestly aimed to carry on its work in accordance with primitive Apostolic Christianity; it did not allow the fourth and fifth centuries to be made its rule. It labored to free Christianity from the servile yoke of ceremonialism, sacerdotalism, and human traditions, not to have that yoke put anew on the neck of Christians, or fastened tighter. Mercersburg theology aims at the very opposite of this.

To some it may seem superfluous to point out these contrasts. But the absurd and ridiculous attempt has really been made, to persuade people that *Mercersburg theology is the great reformation of the nineteenth century!*

It is in no sense a reformation. It is a most uncalled for, inexcusable attempt at revolution, by subverting the old, honored, and faithfully maintained doctrines of the Reformed church, and trying to substitute, partly, a false and pernicious philosophy, and partly to reestablish in the church on the basis of that philosophy, doctrines and usages in worship which the church has always repudiated, and which are utterly at variance with the spirit and faith of the church.



Such is, in brief, the character of the movement against which Dr. Schneck has directed his book. He long saw and bore, with silent grief, what was going on. He saw the ferocity with which the leaders of the movement tried to strike down any one who dared to oppose it. He saw how the *Messenger* obsequiously succumbed and truckled to it, lending its influence to help it on. He saw how the party to the movement, having by various methods gained ascendancy in the Eastern Synod, used their power there to cover and promote their schemes. At last, with all his natural reserve and aversion to public conflict, he could remain quiet no longer. Yielding to the promptings of duty, he sat down in his seventieth year and bore his testimony to the old faith, and against this wretched attempt to pervert and overthrow it.

A noble testimony it is. Tens of thousands in the Church, who, like himself, have long suffered in silence what they knew not how to resist, or who have been kept in ignorance of the nature of the movement, or deceived as to its real character, will thank him for what he has done. No denunciation, no obloquy which may be heaped upon him, no false accusations, no sacerdotal anathemas, such as Lancaster knows well how to forge in its smithery and hurl from its altar, can keep the church from a grateful recognition of the service rendered. They cannot kill it by contemptuous silence, either. The facile *Messenger* may ignore the book. It will circulate as widely as the *Messenger*, and give light where that paper has sought to make darkness reign.

Written in a plain, popular style, the laity will get it, read it, ponder its painful statements and proofs, and rise in the power of their Christian faith to banish errors and evils which had nearly ruined the church.

The book forms a handsome volume of 188 pages, including 48 pages of appendices. It is printed on excellent paper, and the body of the work is in clear, large type. It may be obtained by writing to J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia; to *J. N. Snider*, Chambersburg; to "*The Christian World*," 178 Elm street, Cincinnati. Price, \$1.25, for which it will be sent, by mail, postage prepaid, to any one ordering it with the cash.

We also are prepared to supply it on the above terms, and will gladly fill any orders for it.

*A German translation of the work is being rapidly printed, and will, we hope, be out by April.*

*From the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1334 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.*

*Inlets and Outlets. Familiar talks about the five senses.* By the Rev. Charles A. Smith, D.D.—This pleasant and instructive volume, from the pen of an esteemed familiar friend in the ministry, merits hearty commendation as a book admirably suited for young readers. It will aid their Christian education, by teaching them how to think, and how to turn their thinking to the best account. Parents also will find the book most useful to them in their efforts to train aright the minds and hearts of their children. Make a note of the volume and get it as soon as possible.

*Work for All, and Ways of Working.* By C. P. Bush, D.D. An

excellent book for three classes of persons: first, for those standing idle in the market place; secondly, for those who are in the vineyard but do not seem to know what to get at; and thirdly, for those who are at work without doing much, because they do not know how to work effectively. Let each class get it and read it, and lay vigorous hold of whatever the Lord may call them to do.

*Which is the Apostolic Church?* By Prof. Witherow, of Londonderry. An important question, earnestly though briefly considered, and clearly answered. All in doubt on the subject should read the small but instructive volume.

*From A. S. Barnes & Co., 113 William street, New York.*  
Also to be had of ———, Philadelphia.

*A Manual of Moral Philosophy.* By A. P. Peabody, D.D., LL.D., of Harvard University.

A manual of Ethics, based on the principles of Christianity, and ruled throughout by those principles, is a book greatly needed, and one which would be warmly welcomed unless its style or method should be objectionable. Wuttke's work, translated by Lacroix, is constructed on such a foundation, but is not adapted to America.

As a handbook for beginners, Dr. Peabody's manual comes to us with the recommendations of Drs. Ray Palmer and G. P. Fisher, of Yale. Its difference from other American text books is more formal than material, but in this respect it seems to us to possess advantages over Haven, Hickock, and some others, in clearness of style, simplicity and precision of statement, &c.

*From Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway, New York.*

*Lange's Commentary, in English.* Edited with numerous and valuable additions by Dr. P. Schaff, with the co-operation of several American clergymen. The *seventeenth* volume of this learned work has just reached us. It is the *seventh* on the Old Testament, and includes the twelve minor prophets. The excellence of this Commentary has come to be fully appreciated. No minister can well afford to be without it, and if his private means should not be sufficient to procure it, no congregation can afford to allow their pastor to be long deprived of the benefit of possessing it, at least for their sakes if not for his. Nothing can be added to what has already been said in commendation of the work. What is now needed is to have its advantages placed within the reach of those who need it, and will diligently use it. Three volumes remain, we believe, yet to be published, viz: Two on the Old Testament, and that on Revelation. The early appearance of all is promised. The retail price of each, in cloth, is \$5. But any congregation desiring to present a copy of the entire work to their pastor, could doubtless obtain it at a liberal discount by applying to the publishers.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—APRIL, 1874.—No. 4.

---

CHRIST OUR LIFE.

THIS precious truth is taught in the Holy Scriptures in numerous passages and in a great variety of forms. That it should be set forth so frequently shows the importance attached to it; and that it is presented in such various ways, proves that the Holy Spirit desired that as far as possible it should be rightly understood and guarded against error and misapprehension, and have ever held it.

All Christians hold this truth as one of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and rejoice in it as a most blessed and comforting doctrine. But their estimate of its value, and the measure of their true enjoyment of its consolation, will more or less depend upon their having correct views of its significance. Or even if they have correct views of its import, it will be desirable, perhaps, to have those confirmed and carried forward to a still clearer apprehension of its meaning and force.

In trying to secure this, it will be well, first of all, to collect and keep in immediate view some of the leading

*Scripture passages*

in which the truth is set forth. We shall try to do this in such a way as to show a real connection between the passages, and how they serve to explain each other, and, taken together, set forth the whole revealed truth regarding this fundamental and comforting doctrine.

*First*, passages or declarations directly asserting the truth, without explaining its sense.

"In Him was *life*, and the life was the light of men." John 1: 4.

"I am the way, and the truth and the *life*." John 14: 6.

"The resurrection and the life." 11: 25.

"I am come that they might have *life*." John 10: 10.

"The bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." John 6: 33. "I am that bread of *life*." Verse 48.

"When Christ, *who is our life*, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." Coloss. 3: 4.

These passages or declarations are so direct and explicit as to leave no room for the least doubt, that *in some real and most important sense* Jesus Christ is the fountain, source, cause, and procurer of the life which His true people as such possess. It will be noticed, however, that they do not teach *how* or in what sense He is so, excepting as they may teach this impliedly, or by some intimation or statement found *in the connection* in which the passages or declarations stand. If, therefore, the Scriptures said no more about the matter, but left it merely with such declarations, there *might* be room for difference of opinion regarding the doctrine taught. Especially might some persons, fond of philosophical speculations, set up strange theories on the subject. Taking advantage of the broad term *life*, and the difficulty of finding out what *life in anything* is, such persons might find an excuse in these passages for running off into pantheistic notions of the sense in which Jesus Christ is our life, and defend their false notions by appealing to some of the declarations quoted; just as Luther did with the declaration: "This is my body."

But the Scriptures *do not leave the case with such bare declarations*. As with other fundamental truths revealed and taught, so this truth is set forth in various aspects, and in connections and with additional statements, all which help to a right understanding of it, and serve to guard it against misapprehension and error. This is done,

*Secondly*, in such passages as the following:

"But these things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and *that believing ye might have life through His name*." John 20: 31.



"Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to *give His life a ransom for many.*" Matt. 20: 28. "He came to seek and save the lost." Luke 19: 10.

"I am the good Shepherd: the good Shephred giveth his life for the sheep." John 10: 11.

"Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." John 1: 29. "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." 1: Cor. 5: 7.

"He died the just for the unjust, that He might bring us unto God."

"Who loved me and gave Himself for me."

"For to *this end Christ both died*, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living." Rom. 14: 9.

"For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him *might not perish but have everlasting life.*" "He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life." John 3: 16, 36.

"As many as received Him, to them gave He *power to become the Sons of God*, even to them that believe on His name." John 1: 12.

"Much more, then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be *saved from wrath* through Him." Rom. 5: 9.

"For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him *might be saved.*" John 3: 17.

"But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6: 23.

"Who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep we should live together with Him." 1 Thess. 5: 10.

"God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together," &c. Ephes. 2: 4, 5, and to the end of the chapter.

These passages, let it be carefully noticed, besides speaking of Christ as our life, teach, 1. That *He is so with reference to a peculiar want or condition of mankind* as lost, or under bondage, or condemned, or dead, or exposed to eternal death, or all these together. 2. That the idea or *fact of a vicarious, atoning substitution of Him-*

*self for man* in this wretched state, is very prominently set forth as an essential element of the doctrine that He is our life. 3. That He is our life in a sense which requires a personal laying hold of Him, trusting and believing in Him, on our part, in order that He may be really *our* life. In other words, a condition of His becoming such to any one is laid down, which requires a free personal act on man's part.

Let these three points be distinctly marked, and remembered. They are essential to the right understanding of the doctrine under consideration.

*Thirdly.* There is, however, another class of Scripture passages to be taken into careful consideration here, as bearing directly upon the same doctrine, and serving to make its true sense still more clear. They are such as speak of the part or *office of the Holy Ghost* in the case.

*He* is declared to be the author of regeneration ; that is, of the new life through Christ, which any obtain. They must be

“*Born of the Spirit.*” John 3 : 5, 6, 8.

*He* is declared to be emphatically that *person* of the blessed Trinity who should, as “*another comforter*,” that is, advocate, (Paraclete), in distinction from Christ (our advocate with the Father in heaven.)

“*Abide with us Forever.*” John 14 : 16.

Jesus Christ would “not leave His people comfortless, but would come to them,” by securing from the Father this comforter, namely, “the Holy Ghost.” Hence, it is said by Jesus, in words which must be allowed to have a very remarkable bearing upon our subject :

“Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.” Acts 1 : 8.

Again He is spoken of in such significant words as these :

“If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His. And if Christ be in you, that is, by His spirit, the body is dead because of sin ; but *the spirit is life*, because of righteousness.”

“But *if the spirit* of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by *His spirit* that dwelleth in you.”

And, further on in the same chapter we read, “If ye through



*the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live.* For as many as are *led by the spirit of God, they are the Sons of God.*" Romans 8: 9-14, and, indeed, to the end.

Hence, it is likewise written: "If we *live in the spirit*, let us also walk in the spirit." Galatians 5: 22.

"Because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts *by the Holy-Ghost which is given unto us.*" Rom. 5: 5.

And how perfectly, as well as impressively, does all this agree with those memorable but often forgotten or slighted words with which our Lord both explains and concludes His discourse at Capernaum, recorded in John 6:

"It is *the spirit that quickeneth* (that is, maketh and keepeth alive), the flesh profiteth nothing." John 6: 63.

As every one familiar with the Scriptures well knows, quotations like those given above might be largely multiplied. Those cited, however, must suffice. They are abundant for our purpose. Taking the three sets of passages together, and pondering all in their proper order and connection, it will be found easy to learn from them in what sense Jesus Christ is said to be our life. These several passages will enable us also to see and shun certain grave errors which are sometimes taught on this subject to the great and hurtful perversion of the truth.

When men fall into such errors, the fault is not in the Scriptures, but in themselves.

But instead of proceeding to gather from the above passages the doctrine plainly taught, or drawing any lessons from the subject thus exhibited, we prefer, for the present, to leave each reader to meditate upon them for himself. Look at them again and again; study them, remembering the promised help of the spirit to them that humbly and sincerely desire to be "led into all truth."

Only let no one be tempted to think that there is any contradiction in the passages quoted. So far from this being the case, they all harmoniously teach one and the same truth, as all will see and "know who follow on to know; all who, instead of presuming to teach the Master their vain philosophy, are willing meekly to learn of Him."

---

A HOLY life is a voice; it speaks when the tongue is silent, and is either a constant attraction or a perpetual reproof.

## THE LITURGICAL QUESTION.

(Continued.)

[OUR readers will bear in mind, that this is the report of the majority of the Committee on the Liturgy, read at the Synod in Chambersburg, 1862, and that it sets forth in their own way and words the views of the party represented by the Committee on the subjects discussed. The report was written by Dr. J. W. Nevin, and signed by a majority of the Committee. Let each section of the report, as it appears, be carefully read, that all may see how far its authors are prepared to go in revolutionizing the faith and worship of the church.]—ED.

4. Finally, it belongs to the conception of a liturgy, in the sense now under consideration, that it should engage, to some considerable extent, the active *co-operation of the people*, along with the officiating minister, in its services.\*

The theory of all public worship, of course, is, that the people should join in what is going forward, in some way. But in the case of free prayer, this participation is expected to be more inward than outward, and passive, we may say, rather than active. The system, in its very nature, is unfavorable to any sort of demonstrative interruption on the part of the congregation; it will not suffer either man or woman to speak in the church; and is hardly willing to tolerate, at least, so much as a simple audible *Amen* from "him that occupieth the room of the unlearned." So as regards outward postures, the tendency of it, at least, is to become indifferent to them altogether, knowing no good reason, finally, why the people should not be able to worship God "in spirit and in truth" quite as well sitting comfortably in their pews, as either standing on their feet or bowing upon their knees.

Almost any liturgy, it would seem, should exercise a conservative influence over against the licentiousness of free worship, carried to such extreme as this. *It must be confessed, however, that mere forms of prayer are not enough of themselves to make the ser-*

---

\* It is wholly an unwarranted assumption to assert that the people cannot participate in public worship unless they have a full liturgy, such as the committee favors. Facts abundantly prove, and have proven for centuries, that a congregation can join more heartily and devoutly in worship under free prayer than they are commonly found to do where each member has a prayer book, and must fix his eyes on it during prayer.



vices of the sanctuary what they ought to be, in the view now brought into notice. Here, on the contrary, as before, the mere pulpit liturgy is found to be only too much of one spirit with the free system itself, having no feeling of dependence on the coöworking activity of the congregation, and not summoning this at all to its help, but discouraging it, rather, as something superfluous, at least, if not actually unbecoming, for the proper notion of public worship.

In opposition now, however, to all this, such a liturgy as we are speaking of, invokes and calls into requisition, necessarily, the active assistance of the people.\* Its language to the congregation is practically always: "I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God." No simply passive concurrence will answer its purpose; no merely silent thought is enough for it; it must have the outward demonstration of both act and word. It is a transaction, the doing of a work, to which the people are expected to lay hand, and that cannot go forward rightly without their assisting coöperation. Where the sense of the liturgical prevails in this sort, the imagination of forms for the minister, without corresponding forms for the worshipping congregation, is felt to be absurd. The people must so join in what is going forward, that this shall seem to be for them plainly a real objective work then and there taking place, in which they are themselves not spectators or hearers only, but participant actors. *There must be gestures and postures significant of faith in what the service thus means, acts of bodily worship fitly suited to corresponding acts of the spirit, responses of the tongue to seal and confirm the silent responses of the heart.*

It will not do to call these things the idle mummary of superstition. If they seem mummary to any, it can only be most assuredly because they have themselves no lively sense of the true nature of Christian worship, in the view just described. What causes the use of such externalizing forms to be felt as formal only, and nothing more, is not the mere outwardness of the forms themselves, but the want of the inward soul they are required to express. Then, indeed, the service becomes mummary; but the mummary is in the inward habit of the worshiper at the time, more

\* It does so no more than under free prayer. Nay, it does so less, unless by "active assistance" is meant the assistance of the mouth, that is, lip-service. But this, surely, is not the help most needful and important in public or common worship.

than in his outward habit. A worship that pretends to pass itself off as purely inward and spiritual, and that has in itself no need for any outward word or act, carries in it the nature of mockery quite as much, to say the least, as a worship that holds in outward forms altogether. Beyond all question, the true idea of worship requires the union of both. Such is the relation everywhere of inward and outward, in our human constitution. Soul and body, thought and word, are the natural and necessary complement of each other, in every sphere of our existence. Devotional forms, then, the outward actings and utterings of worship on the part of the people, are not only to be tolerated in the services of the sanctuary—they are to be prescribed and enjoined as the necessary condition of worship in a truly spiritual form, without which it must ever be in danger of lapsing into mere spectacular show of the very worst kind. Let the outward and the inward here go hand in hand together. *Let it be considered a part of religion to do bodily reverence, in all proper ways, to the SACRAMENTAL HOLINESS which is felt to inhabit the house of God. Let all faces, in the time of prayer, be turned toward the altar. Let there be risings and bowings, where it may seem to be meet, in token of the consenting adorations of the people.\** Let there be hymns, and psalms, and anthems, and chants, choral songs and antiphonal concerts of praise. In the language of David: "Let the people praise thee, O God; let all the people praise thee." Let them also not keep silence entirely in the offices of public confession and prayer. On fit occasions, "let all the people say, *Amen*;" say it not mentally alone, but aloud with their lips; and let it be their privilege to join, also, when proper, in other vocal responses, helpful alike to the spirit of the officiating liturgist and to themselves. Let "young men and maidens, old men and children," learn to worship the God of Israel in this way; for *such life-like worship is comely, and most becoming at the same time to the Lord's house.*

\*Note well this whole passage. Let each one picture to himself a congregation doing what the committee here holds up as the only kind of public worship worthy of the name. Would any one suspect that he was in a Reformed church, where matters were conducted in this style? If the committee thought such worship the best kind, why did they not go where they might have it to their heart's content?

But why have "all faces turned towards the altar?" The Psalmist says: "*I will look unto the Lord.*" Why does the committee want us all to look to the altar? Can any other reason be given than that which the Romanist gives for doing so? It is there the sacrifice of the mass is offered. Messrs. Wolff, Wagner, Ermentrout, and the score of others who have apostatized to Rome, might well say, we have done only what Nevinism taught us was the best thing to be done.



*It is the kind of worship, especially, that suits the wants of children and plain people.\** For, however it may be with others, having more education, *they*, at least, have no power whatever to get along with mere thinking in their devotions; word and act, and outward symbol, *are as necessary to their spiritual exercises as the breath of their nostrils*; and it would seem to be very certain, therefore, that they can never be effectually edified or educated by any religious services in which all depends on mental processes merely, without any such outward help. For that interest of educational religion of which we have spoken before, it is in this form, above all, that a liturgy deserves to be considered of indispensable account.

Such, altogether, is the idea of a liturgy, in that second view which we have now been trying to explain. *It stands related to the first conception, before noticed, not in the way of contrast merely, but in the way, also, of very considerable opposition.†* Those who have entered into the sense of the liturgical in this second form, can never be satisfied with what may claim to be the liturgical in the other form. To their mind, all worship which simply substitutes *praying by book* for extemporary prayer, without any farther difference, *is only pseudo-liturgical* at best, and ends in being, at the last, very much the same thing with that for which it is substituted. It is felt, indeed, that the argument for liturgical worship is to a great extent shorn of its force, where it is made to turn on *this bastard conception‡* of what a liturgy rightly means. Over against such *merely outward fixation of forms*, it is quite possible for free prayer to have the best of the comparison. *Forms of this sort must almost necessarily seem to be formal only, and therefore slavish, also, and dead.* The advocates of the free system, accordingly, contrive for the most part to join issue with the cause of liturgies under this view only; and it is but too frequently the

\* How ignorant learned men can be. Here we have a sweeping assertion which any intelligent Episcopalian can tell you is contradicted by the entire experience of their church. Why it has been their complaint for years, that they cannot get plain people to fall in with their ritualistic way of worship. Hence, some Episcopalians are asking for more freedom, whilst others (high-churchmen) are introducing millinery, music, and pantomime marchings (processions) of boys dressed up in white gowns, and carrying banners, so as to attract and draw people by the nice and solemn show.

† This is an admission worthy of being specially noted. The new-order way of worship, by its ritualism, is acknowledged *not only to be unlike* our old, free liturgy way, but in very considerable opposition to it. Does the Lancaster Faculty call this *development*?

‡ This entire passage is a shameful vituperation of the Reformed church.

case, that the friends of the cause are not prepared to take any higher ground. Then the controversy, as a matter of course, becomes unequal and confused; for the reasons in favor of a liturgy, as we have given them before, even where they may seem to regard the use of forms only, always looks farther than this in truth for those who feel their force, and never come to their full effect till they are made to refer themselves to the conception of a liturgy in its right sense; while the main strength of the argument, without such reference, can never come into view at all. For this reason it is believed, also, that what is called liturgical worship, in that first character of which we have spoken, can never make head successfully, or even hold its own for any length of time, against the inroads of the free system. Be the matter as it may, theoretically, the victory will always turn out to be practically, at last, on the unliturgical side. There is no case known in history, where it has been found possible to bring a liturgy of this unliturgical sort into full, living and abiding popular use; and there is no room to expect anything of the kind in time to come. In our own country, in particular, no such liturgy, however excellently composed, can ever come into general use with any religious denomination. Whatever sense there may be, in any quarter, of the evils belonging to the system of free worship, it will be felt always that the harness of a purely outward service-book is something worse. It will prove irksome in the end, not only to those who are constitutionally opposed to all liturgies, but also to those whose hearts yearn for what they conceive to be the true spirit of Christian worship in this, to them, seemingly better way; and the result will be, accordingly, a sort of common consent on both sides to let the book pass into practical oblivion, as being in truth what neither class has been either seeking or wanting. No liturgical experiment in this form, it is believed, can ever succeed; and it can only be a waste of labor, therefore, for a church to bestow thought or pains on any such object.\*

---

If it be asked, now, on which of these two liturgical schemes the *Provisional Liturgy* of the German Reformed church has been constructed, the answer must be, of course, that it was intended

---

\* Random assertions again.



to be prevailingly a liturgy for the altar, and not simply a pulpit liturgy. It aims at being churchly, sacramental, and in proper measure also priestly. It is formed to move round the sun of righteousness in the heavenly orbit of the church year. It seeks to make the people outwardly active, along with the minister, in the outward solemnities of public worship. In all this it falls in with what may be considered the reigning genius of such worship in the first ages of the church; and, in doing so, has incorporated into itself largely, of course, those primitive forms which have been considered classical and sacred for all liturgical use from the beginning. This much is patent at once on the face of the new liturgy; and it has never pretended to appear in any other character.

The liturgy may be said to have worked itself into this form, with a *kind of inward necessity*, in the general mind of the Committee to whom it owes its preparation. Their studies, conferences, and experimental endeavors, shut them up in a very slow way to this, finally, as the only proper conclusion of their work. *They were themselves brought more and more under the power of an idea, which carried them with inexorable force its own way; so that they were compelled to change again and again what they had previously prepared, till all was brought to take at last its present shape.*

The Committee knew, of course, that in carrying out their work in this way, *they were proposing to themselves something more* than the reproduction, simply, of any older liturgy of the Reformed church—something more than mere compilation of offices and forms, modeled on the plan of these liturgies generally. *They had full regard to these, indeed, in their place,\** but they had no thought of being bound by them as the only rule and measure of their labors. They considered it their duty to take a wider range of observation, to survey the whole field of liturgical literature, and especially to study the genius and spirit of the liturgies that have come down to us from the first Christian ages, with the view of maintaining, as much as might be, a true successional connection with the substance, at least, of their ancient life. So much seemed to be due to the claims of the subject itself, and to the general posture which the best Protestant thinking has come to

\*Where and when did the committee ever show such a spirit? Never anywhere that we know of. On the contrary, there was rather the very opposite displayed, from the moment the committee came "under the power" of their own notions of what a liturgy should be.

hold with regard to it at the present time ; and their own convictions of right made it impossible for the Committee to go forward with their work in any other way.

It was supposed that the old liturgies of the Reformed church needed this manner of broad and comprehensive revision. *With all our respect for the sixteenth century*, there is no reason why we should be bound slavishly by all its opinions and judgments ; no reason why we should not see and acknowledge its defects, where they may appear plainly to exist.\* The position occupied by the churches of the Reformation was not in general favorable to the production of good liturgies. Attention was too much taken up with other interests ; there was too little knowledge of liturgical antiquities ; the subject was given up too much to mere particular fancy and taste, without any regard to necessary principles and laws. It is to be freely admitted, moreover, that *there lay in the distinguishing spirit of the Reformed Confession, as such, from the beginning, a tendency in opposition to the constraint of fixed religious rites and ceremonies*, which could hardly fail to exert an injurious influence on any work of this sort. It belongs, as we all know, to the Reformed church to represent that side of the Christian life in which the inward, the free, the spiritual in religion, are asserted against the authority of the merely outward in every view. Such is her historical vocation ; such is her genius ; and such, of course, then, is the form also in which she is most exposed to the danger of falling into error and wrong. For, it is with the constitution of churches here as we find it to be with the temperament of individuals. At each temperament the sanguine, the choleric, the melancholic, and the phlegmatic, has its own virtues and merits, but along with this also its own corresponding proclivities to faulty excess, which, to take note of, implies no want of respect for the goodness of the temperament itself ; so in the case of churches, or religious confessions, it is the peculiarity of their constitutional mission precisely, if they have any, that may be said to determine for them always their nearest liability to error ; and to acknowledge this, we say again, amounts not of itself to any censure whatever upon that which is thus made the occasion

\* From such *respect* the Reformed church of the 16th century might well beg to be delivered. So far from *respect*, it is hard to conceive by what course more contempt could have been shown. To pinch a man's nose is considered insulting. Here the church was treated as a nose of wax to be turned and twisted just to suit the taste and temper of those not satisfied with the church in her true historical character.



of abuse. While we honor, then, the constitutional character of the Reformed church, (!) in the general view of which we are now speaking, we ought to be willing to admit that it carried in it a tendency to what we may call extreme simplicity and spiritualism, over against the worship of the Catholic church, and that this stood in the way of its producing a full liturgical cultus, in the proper sense of the term. Liturgies, of course, were everywhere introduced, for no one thought then of a perfectly free worship. But the right auspices for their production were not at hand. The disposition to get away, as much as possible, from the outward usages of the Roman church, was the cause of extreme views in the opposite direction. There was no proper insight into the true conception of a liturgy, regarded as an organic scheme of worship; and no active sympathy, therefore, with the idea of worship in any such form. Liturgies formed in such circumstances were, we may say, necessarily imperfect, and do not deserve to be regarded as binding models for the use of the church in all subsequent times.

(To be continued.)

---

#### HET HEIDELBERG CATECHISM AND THE APOSTLES' CREED.

THE *Reformed Messenger* of February 18, under the head of *Theology and Criticism*, written by one of the Professors at Lancaster, contains some things in regard to the different views that are held respecting the Heidelberg Catechism and the Apostles' Creed, which call for some remarks. It is always well to have every question that is discussed, clearly defined, and the positions of each side accurately stated. This we do not think is done by the writer here referred to, and for this reason we notice it.

The criticism is evidently directed against those of us who have opposed the high-church movement, or as it is more commonly called, the Mercersburg-Lancaster Theology. This system, as is known, has all along claimed the peculiar merit of originality, and was evidently for awhile pleased when it was styled a

*new theology and philosophy.* It, indeed, often set up this claim for itself.

In trying the merits of this system we and others have often quoted the Heidelberg Catechism and the views of the Reformers against it, and in this way showed that it could have no claims for the Reformed church. In doing this, however, we had not the most remote idea that we were setting up the claim of infallibility for our confession of faith, or of the confessions in general. Yet this is the charge of the writer here referred to, which seems to give him occasion to say how *much he respects* and loves the Heidelberg Catechism. This is truly refreshing. We will let him speak for himself:

"Some professed friends of the Protestant faith resist any change in theological views, not because they are contrary to the Scriptures, but because they seem to be in conflict with the Protestant Confessions. These Confessions are the standards and touchstone of truth, and whatever does not square entirely with the literal sense of these Confessions, is denounced as false and unevangelical.

"For these excellent Confessions, both Lutheran and Reformed, we cherish no other sentiment but that of profound respect. \* \* \* Especially do we honor the Heidelberg Catechism as the best exponent of the Reformed faith. But we do not exalt the Catechism to a position cöordinate with that of the New Testament. We honor it as the Reformers themselves honored it. We honor it as Frederick the Pious and the Church of the Palatinate received it, namely, as a human book, containing an excellent summary of sound Christian doctrine; but a book subordinate to the Apostles' Creed and to the Divine Word; a book that refers to the authority of the divine word as the only standard of truth, by which standard, under the light and guidance of the Spirit, all its teachings are to be tried. But that this book should be handed down from century to century as the infallible teacher of Protestant truth, is a notion that never entered the minds of the men that framed it, being in direct conflict with one of the fundamental principles of the Protestant Reformation.

"Yet this unevangelical notion, which the Reformers repudiated, is now the basis of argument, adopted by many who claim to be in the truest sense Protestant and Reformed. They make uninspired books and human teaching the standard of truth."



Now, we would like to know who among all that have spoken and written against this new theology has ever held that the Heidelberg Catechism, or the Commentary of Ursinus, to which we have often appealed, was divinely inspired like the Scriptures? There have been many articles touching this subject in this periodical, as well as in the *Christian World*, but we challenge the writer of the above to produce a single one who has advocated what he here charges against us. We hold no such views, and are ready to join hands with him in changing the Heidelberg Catechism so soon as he or any one else will show that its teachings are in conflict with the Word of God, the only infallible and unchangeable standard of truth. This being so, it is clear that the Professor has made an incorrect statement, and ought, in fairness, to take it back, unless he can prove his statement.

When we have appealed to the Heidelberg Catechism as condemning the new theology, we have done it in the belief that the church, during its entire history, has invariably regarded its teachings as being in full harmony with the Scriptures. This being so, any doctrine condemned by the Catechism, is at the same time condemned by the Scriptures.

So, when we have adduced the testimony of Zwingli, Calvin, or Ursinus, as being against these high-church notions, we have done so for the reason, not that they were infallible, but that they have all along been regarded as the best exponents of the doctrines of the Reformed church in their true historical sense; and that if any one advances views contrary thereto, the presumption is that he has repudiated the old faith as founded on the Scriptures.

This again does not mean that there can be no advance or clearer apprehension and better statement of the truth, or that there must be a repristination of the views held three hundred years ago. All talk of this kind is only throwing dust in the air and befogging things. No one has ever advocated such absurdities, and opponents must certainly know this. But whilst repudiating these charges, we at the same time hold that whatever advance there may be it must be a *legitimate outgrowth of principles already adopted and received*, and not a substitution of something else in their place. The idea of development always implies the evolution of what is at hand, and a carrying of it forward to a higher stage of perfection in full harmony with its own nature.

Such an advance as this we hail with joy ; but when an attempt is made to bring in *a new system* of philosophy and theology like that which the Professor has advocated, a system which, in many respects, is in direct conflict with the old faith of the church, then we demur, and call it, not an advance, but an *innovation* or a repudiation of the old.

In reading the article from which the above extracts are taken, we were quite amused to see how far the Professor has wheeled around in appealing as bravely as he does to the authority of *the written Word*, and charging us with relying on tradition for our support. We could not help asking ourselves as we read, "Does this not sound strangely—coming from Lancaster?" Has he, indeed, forgotten all that his side of the house has written *upon tradition and the living word*?

Why, brother, you have taken our place and put us where you and your friends have always been understood to stand. We have no objections of your joining *our ranks* if you repudiate your former false views ; but do not steal our armor and ammunition, and put your old clubs in our hands, and your old rags on our backs, and tell the people it was always so, that you extolled *the written Word*, whilst we *clung to tradition*. The history of the controversy will not allow you to make this statement. Nor is it fair to do so. If you have repudiated your former position, and are willing to take the Catechism and interpret it in its true historical sense, as Frederick the Pious, and the Church of the Palatinate understood it, then the controversy is at an end ; for this is just what we have been all the while contending for, and what we have been appealing to the Confessions and writings of the Reformers to prove.

But what we would be glad to know, does the Professor mean, when he says, that he receives the Heidelberg Catechism "as a human book, containing an excellent summary of sound Christian doctrine, but a book subordinate *to the Apostles' Creed and the Divine Word*." Are we to understand him to teach that the Apostles' Creed is *an inspired production* and on a level with the Divine Word. Judging from the way in which he here speaks of it, and from remarks of a similar kind that have often been made in this controversy, we are led to believe that he regards the Apostles' Creed of equal authority with the Scriptures. But it was not so that Frederick the Pious, the Church of the Pala-



tinatē, Ursinus, Calvin, or any of the Reformers, regarded the Creed.

Will the Professor be more explicit and tell us plainly what he means when he says the Catechism *is subordinate to the Creed*? This may mean much or little, just as he chooses to explain it. Ursinus, in interpreting the different articles of the Creed, gives us to understand what it *means for the Reformed church*, just as he does in the case of the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. This has been understood to be the faith of our church for three hundred years, and what the Professors at Lancaster, Ursinus, Tiffin, as well as our ministers generally are to receive, teach and defend as being the doctrine of the Reformed church. And if any one has the right to reject this part of the Catechism, and say it is not what the Creed means to which it is subordinate, then he or any one else can do the same thing with any other part of the Catechism, which would be to make it succumb to every man's private judgment, and so destroy its authority as a confession.

This is certainly a new position for any one to take in the Reformed church; and as we have had so many novelties started of late by these teachers, it may be well to know at the outset what they mean by the Heidelberg Catechism *being subordinate to the Creed*. The constitution requires candidates for the ministry, church membership, &c., to profess belief in certain things as being *in accordance with the Word of God*; but we have the first time to hear any one asked if *he also believes them to be in accordance with the Creed*, which should be added if the Catechism is subordinate to it as a confession.

To put the fears of the Lancaster Professor at rest, we will here say what he has certainly known full well all along, that those of us who oppose the Mercersburg-Lancaster innovations have **never** intimated that the Heidelberg Catechism was inspired; nor do we make tradition the basis of our faith. This more properly belongs to his side of the house; nor do we regard the Apostles' Creed, or any of the other confessions as being inspired and on a level with the Scriptures. The only value they have for us, and the respect which we have for them, lies in their harmony with the Word of God, the ultimate and only rule of faith.

That they were so regarded by Frederick the Pious, the Church of the Palatinate and the Reformers generally, is evident from the following extracts from the Commentary of Ursinus:

"Human traditions, the ordinances of Popes, and the decrees of councils are therefore excluded from being the objects of faith, for faith cannot rely upon any thing but the Word of God, as an immovable foundation.

"The power to give new laws concerning the worship of God, or to give new articles of faith binding the conscience, belongs to no assembly of men, or of angels, but to God alone.

"The writings concerning the doctrines of the church are either *divine*, such as have been written by the prophets and apostles, who were immediately inspired of God; or *ecclesiastical*, such as have been written by the doctors of the church in the name of the whole church, as the creeds, or for particular churches, as catechisms, &c." Com. of Ursinus on 22d and 23d questions of Heidelberg Catechism.

The Lancaster professor, in the article from which we quote, is only giving clearer expression to what has been long ago more modestly asserted. If the reader will refer to the Provisional Liturgy, he will find under the ordination formula this question: "Do you receive the doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism as flowing from the Bible, *and answering to the proper sense of the ancient creeds?*" In the Order of Worship, which is a revision of the Provisional Liturgy, it is somewhat differently stated as follows: "Do you receive the confessional system of the Heidelberg Catechism, as being in harmony with the *Bible and the ancient Creeds?*"

These questions, differing from the Constitution, and from any thing ever previously found in the formulas of the church, show that there was here as in other respects a departure from the old faith and customs of our fathers. Now we are told *the Catechism is subordinate to the Creed and the Bible*, without being told in what sense this is to be understood. We wait for more light.

G. W. W.

---

BARON ROTHSCHILD, of London, gives assistance, it is stated, regardless of religious creed, to every chapel, school or almshouse in his own neighborhood in that city.



WHENCE THE TARES?

TARES may be taken as an emblem not only of false members in the church, but also of their false views. In this respect they represent the *pernicious doctrines* which may spring up and spread even in that part of *the field*, the world, which has been Christianized both in doctrine and life.

It is a sad fact, and a very painful one, that false doctrines, gross perversions of fundamental Gospel truths, have over and over again sprung up in churches planted by the most evangelical hands, and trained on the most evangelical principles. Even those of Galatia, on which the Lord, by the labors of Paul, bestowed such special care, were soon overrun with weeds of noxious error. And some of the leading churches of Asia Minor, as those of Pergamos, Ephesus, Thyatira and Sardis, are solemnly warned, by the glorified Jesus from heaven, against tolerating certain heresies which had been secretly scattered among them.

Indeed, the history of Christianity in all ages is largely a narrative of the bitter conflicts in which Gospel truth has had constantly to engage in opposing the bold or cunning encroachments of error. It has been a history of "contending for the faith once delivered to the saints."

The contest has by no means ended. Our day furnishes illustrations of the same mournful fact. And what touches us more closely and painfully is, that such illustrations are supplied by the state of our own church at this time.

No more faithful witness for Apostolic Gospel principles, in doctrine and in practice, ever testified and toiled for a pure Christianity than the Reformed church, in the broader sense, or than our branch of that church in particular. Using the best aids of former ages, it went directly to the Lord and His Word to discover again, and to reestablish "the precious faith" and the purest worships of primitive times. The results of those devout efforts were set forth in clear, simple, distinct terms, in Confessions of faith and Catechism, all appealing directly to the *Scriptures* in support and proof of the doctrines stated. The doctrines insisted upon as fundamental, according to the Gospel, were presented and defined with special care. There was no cramping of Christian liberty, no attempt to put hard fetters upon

private judgment, in regard to secondary or less essential things. But essential truths were most explicitly taught and earnestly enjoined. Various deceitful and deceptive errors previously advanced, bearing against such fundamental truths, were freely exposed and refuted. In some cases this was done in a way that seems almost prophetic of like errors which might long afterwards be advocated. Only look at this passage from a book written more than three hundred years ago:

"They (*i. e.*, the Word and Sacraments) differ in their *objects*. The Word, with its various commands and promises, is preached to all men, without any distinction; to the unregenerated, as well as to those who are regenerated, and members of the church. *It is preached to the former, that they may be regenerated, and exercise faith in Christ, or be rendered wholly inexcusable; and to the latter, that their faith may be more and more confirmed. The Sacraments, on the other hand, are dispensed only to those who are members of the church, who profess repentance and faith, and are designed to preserve and strengthen their faith. The Word is that through which the Holy Ghost commences and confirms faith in us, and, for this reason, should go before the Sacraments. The Sacraments are means through which the Holy Ghost confirms faith already called into exercise, and, for this reason, ought to follow the Word.*"

Here *Ursinus*, for it is no other (*Comm.*, p. 352), appears to be so fortifying the true doctrine of the Sacraments, that a perversion of them on Reformed ground would be impossible. Or, at least, he explains the matter so fully and decidedly, that it might well be supposed that none would ever be bold enough to put forward and maintain the very opposite view, and yet pretend to be Reformed.

#### *Tares Among the Wheat.*

But, notwithstanding all this care, this zealous, pious precaution, that which seemed to be so carefully guarded against has come to pass. Tares have been sown among the wheat, have sprung up and borne their deplorable fruit. They have done worse. Beside demanding toleration, so as to be allowed to stand among or beside the wheat, that "both might grow together until the harvest," they have tried to smother and root



out the wheat, and thus get the whole field to themselves. Impudent tares! Audacious darnel! Intoxicated\* with the success of getting into the field, they soon betray their exterminating spirit towards that to which the field fairly belongs. Just as when Popery got into the church, it never rested until it had cleared the whole Gospel out of it.

Dropping the figure, instead of the old established Gospel faith of the Reformed church, great efforts have been made to modify and radically alter the principles and doctrines of that faith. Worse has been done. In the place of some of the most fundamental doctrines of the church, errors have been substituted which are utterly subversive of those doctrines, and against which the church has been earnestly testifying during her entire history.

As has been clearly proven in the pages of the *Monthly* for the past six years, this has happened with regard to the doctrines of redemption by the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ, or the person and the work of Christ; that of the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration; that of the church and the Sacraments, and, to name no others now, that of the Gospel ministry.

Were those who have been doing this to prepare a new Confession of faith for the church, according to their theory and fancies, what a contrast, what an antagonism would it present to the Heidelberg Catechism and other Reformed Confessions! The document which such a thought opens out to view cannot, however, be further described now. But,

*Whence these Tares?*

Or, rather, how have they gotten into the field and gained such headway? For we do not care to consider, or attempt to consider, the question of their origin and source so much as that other more practical one—how have they come to secure such a footing, and to spread so widely? This inquiry is legitimately involved in the other. It is one, also, which has naturally arisen in many minds.

How could such errors as those referred to gain entrance and their apparent prevalence in such a church as ours?

Several answers suggest themselves. Let them be fairly given, but frankly, and well pondered.

---

\* Eating the seeds of tares is said to produce vertigo, or a sort of staggering intoxication.

*First*, the errors introduced and advocated may not be seen or thought to be such at the start, by those who bring them into the church. They may seem to be only a slight and allowable modification of the doctrines or faith of the church, a merely better way of stating the truth, or fuller development of it. In other words, those who do this may deceive themselves, or be deceived by terms and words, or by some peculiar philosophy they adopt.

*Secondly*, in this way they are drawn on further and further, "*under the power of an idea which carries them with inexorable force its own way*," until they see how widely and fundamentally their new notions differ from the established faith of the church. But as they go on they become more and more dissatisfied with the old faith, and more warmly drawn to their new views, until, in their private convictions and public efforts, the old is set aside and the new advocated.

*Thirdly*, the new views on errors thus embraced, may be held and taught in the most careful and plausible manner, be gradually brought out and quietly inculcated. Efforts may be made to show how much better they are than the old, and that, although they seem to be contrary to the Scriptures, as understood by the church, and contrary to all the previous teachings of the church, the difference is not essential—not as great and real as it may seem to be.

*Fourthly*, a further explanation is furnished by the fact that the errors may be pressed under the belief and the plea that they are only meant as an offset and corrective of some evils that had crept into the church, and which were damaging her true life and interests. The new views now are urged simply as a remedy for those evils, and seem to aim at nothing further.

*Fifthly*, the errors may be scattered in a part of the field or church where they would be likely to have the most influence in quietly but powerfully affecting the whole life of the church. Tares scattered on a hill-top will be carried further by the wind than tares sown in some secluded valley. Poison put into a fountain will be carried out with the stream issuing from the fountain, and rapidly spread through the land.

*Sixthly*, no one beyond the immediate circle of those adopting and inculcating such errors, may have any suspicion of the movement. There may be such feelings of confidence, and so strong a sense of security, that even if some cry or alarm is raised, or some



indications of danger and mischief do show themselves, the church at large will not heed them.

*Seventhly*, if, when it becomes evident that serious errors are being taught, and fundamental doctrines are to be set aside, those in the church who clearly see this speak out or write against the dangerous and hurtful movement, its friends and advocates may cry out that they are misrepresented, wronged, and unjustly assailed. They may claim to love the church, its doctrine, catechism, and all belonging to it, as much as those who are thus opposing them. By various means they may try to excite bitter feelings against all who stand in their way, denounce them as troublers in Israel, persons who cause contention, discord, and sedition. In such a case what can the church at large, that is, the members, do? Perhaps all they learn about the whole matter, is learned from a partisan church paper under the power or influence of the advocates of the errors, and which may not allow the other side a fair chance of being heard. Thus error has the chief means of spreading itself in its hands, and what is to hinder its spread?

*Eighthly*, the leading advocates of error may have those of their own mind scattered over the church, who zealously uphold and defend them in their cause. Or, what is still more dangerous and injurious, there may be many here and there over the church who do not agree at heart with the errors taught, but who will not be persuaded that those who teach them really mean what they say, or hold the false doctrines with which they are charged. This has its harmful influence for the time, and gives error so much more opportunity for striking its roots deeper, and extending itself.

From facts like these, it is easy enough to see how *tares* may be brought into a church and spread over the field. And yet all the ways in which it may be done, and is sometimes done, have not been named. Some of the ways employed, it would be a shame to repeat. Let those stated suffice. They will suffice to relieve the minds of any who may be perplexed, perhaps even to the point of extreme doubting and despondency, by what has seemed to them a most strange and inexplicable thing.

But bad as the case may be, there is hope. He who foretold the final triumph of His gospel, foresaw that it would have this evil of "tares in the field" to overcome. And yet He has promised

that in the end truth shall prevail. There is, therefore, good reason for assured confidence. Only now that the evil has been discovered, let all who see it and deplore it, unite in faithfully and wisely doing their duty.

The mischief done, and still threatening, may be great. But it may not be as widespread as it seems to be, or as the advocates of the errors may represent them to be. Many may hitherto have countenanced or supported the whole movement under wrong views as to its real character and aims. When they once fairly understand what it all means and involves, and come to see that the prevalence of certain views must result in the overthrow of the old evangelical faith of the church, they will not only refuse longer to favor the innovations, but will firmly withstand them.

---

#### "WHAT MANNER OF SPIRIT?"

RECENTLY a number of one of "OUR" *authorized* church papers was sent me as a *sample* copy. I was rather pleased with it, and was just where, by retrenching yet further, a dollar could be saved out of the very meagre salary of a preacher, to pay for it one year, when my eyes fell upon a few sentences that thoroughly checked my wish to receive its stated visits. Here they are: "divinely commissioned as a teacher of *positive* faith. *Our* church holds this (Evangelical faith) in her Christological theology and administers *real* Sacraments as cöordinate with the preaching of the Word of truth." The other is, "It is questionable whether there is power in the *negative* and *eviscerated Puritan* system of religion prevailing in New England, and thence affecting a large part of the religious thinking of the west, which, by *courtesy*, may be called evangelical, whether there is saving power enough in that to reach effectively the millions who belong to its general life by birthright inheritance." It is hard to say which of these sentences, in its spirit, most repelled me. One to me seemed full of the spirit that says, "Stand off, for I am holier than thou," and that is peculiar to high-churchmen, and full of the bigotry of the sect-spirit. The other seemed animate with petty spite, and was about on a level with the usages that obtain in partisan politics for the purposes of disparagement. That these words should be found in an



article that sets forth the neglect and criminality of "*our church*" in failing to look after those who stray west from its fold, and picturing the loss thus sustained by the easy transition of the children of our church to Puritan folds where no *real* Sacraments are administered, complicated the matter yet more to me, so that it was impossible to appreciate the spirit of the writer. How can it be that "*our church*," with her Christological theology, and administering *real* Sacrament can be so derelict, and that her power to retain her children is so slight? It put me to thinking, can the negative and eviscerated Puritan religion be worse than this? Then I remembered the words of our Lord, "By their *fruits* shall ye know them." If it should be true that this much abused Puritan religion was still as in Paul's day, turning the world upside down, why, then, negative and *bowelless* as it is, it is doing more than some churches that administered *real* Sacraments and waste their energies in boasting. As our thoughts burned within us, the January number of the venerable *Missionary Herald* lying on the table by me, invited me to examine what negative Puritan religion, so deprived of its bowels, was doing in one direction. What power it was putting forth from its cold and barren rocky hills. Its negative religion had constrained its churches with their money to establish 19 missions and 513 stations on heathen ground. This eviscerated religion had constrained 357 of its children to deny themselves and forsake all things, that they might teach all nations and make disciples of them. Of *these*, 202 were ladies—refined, educated Christian women. What power this negative Puritan religion must have. By the side of the dear old *Herald* we see the *American Messenger*, another record of the doings of this negative and eviscerated Puritan religion. What story does it tell? It *only* tells of those whose religion had power—positive power to lead these Puritans to seek out, instruct and lead to Jesus the four millions of *freed-men* of the south. What a pity that these men and women who *have no real Sacraments* to administer by priests, and no Christological theology of the Mercersburg tinge to teach, and whose negative and disemboweled religion is so simple, should be allowed to precede *our church* in this noble work. To-night, while we write, a noble, refined, intelligent Christian woman is alone in a southern State—denied the society of those inferior to her. She toils month after month for the ignorant negroes. All her reward—and it

cheers her—is to see the seed of eternal love quicken in the hearts of those for whom she has forsaken *home*. If this despised Puritan religion is animated by such power of love, denial and sacrifice, what ought not *our* religion to do, that is positive and administers real Sacraments.

I have not time nor space to look over the entire field of the Puritan activity of New England. I could yet bring out its noble home mission work as it follows up its errant children as they wander from their Yankee homes toward the setting sun. Carry them the Bible; send the preacher with what they gladly receive as real Sacraments and God's eternal truth as revealed in Christ; build churches and school houses and colleges for them, and arm them with trained teachers. Besides this, then, is their work of scattering Sabbath-schools, like gems of sparkling light, in every new and neglected place, so that the children may not forget the God that guided the Mayflower, and be taught to love that precious Saviour that cheered the hearts, sustained the faith, and purified the lives of the Pilgrims of Massachusetts Bay. While I am not *tainted* with Puritan blood, nor believer of any vagary started on New England soil, I was constrained to decline "the church paper," and had no heart to aid in such wholesale attacks on any workers in the Lord's vineyard. Let them work on. They are doing—have done—a work that Christ will not forget. He has blest it, and on every heathen land is their record for zeal for Christ and love for souls. We are all too near the day when the Evangelical Alliance shed its pentecostal spirit on our souls, to sympathize with the words and spirit that deny truth to the doctrine, and real Sacraments to the administration of the ministers of churches other than "our" own.

Would that the day had come when in *our* church men should cease to prate their unintelligible gibberish, which they are pleased to call philosophy (vainly so called), and the matchless nonsense under the name of Christological theology, which babbles about "inward conjunction in a real way," "united with manhood in its deepest substance originally," "supernatural constitutions," etc., etc., etc., which they call theology, and which is taught instead of Christ, and Him crucified, and go to work in the name and spirit of Jesus Christ, and emulate in zeal, labor, sacrifices and love, the negative and eviscerated Puritan religion, instead of abusing it. Instead of glorying in the administration of *real*



Sacraments, show their grace and power, not in calling down fire from heaven, but in surpassing acts of faith and holy zeal, how soon would the wilderness, now desolate from its neglect, flourish in beauty, putting forth bud and blossom for a maturity of fruit. How much better to evoke the spirit of sacrifice and consecration that will devote the sons and daughters of "our" church to the cause of Christ and of souls, that will *draw* the hoards of gold that are hidden in the treasury of "our" people, that have *real* Sacraments administered to them by real priests, and with *it* build churches, schools, etc., in lands of darkness, that will equip their sons for a life-work in far off lands of sin, teaching them to fear God and love Jesus. When our authorized papers do for Christ what they now do for sect and for party, I will invite their visit; not till then.

ULRIC.

---

SAILING UNDER FALSE COLORS.

[THE following article will serve a needful purpose. It has been furnished by a layman, who has enjoyed the amplest opportunities for becoming acquainted with the teachings of the party referred to. In this view, added to the fact that at one time the personal sympathies of the writer were with that party, the testimony borne is very significant.]—ED.

Men are frequently deceived by what *appears* to be truth, but what is in reality a *fearful perversion* of it.

This perversion is two-fold as to its origin. It may (and frequently does) arise from ignorance—from unwittingly advancing error for truth. In this respect it is not a *conscious* act—not the effect of *self*-apprehended sophism. The agent is himself deceived. His eyes are blinded, and in his darkness he substitutes the shadow of sophistry for the substance of truth. When charged with error, he either endeavors, by illogical reasoning, to demonstrate that he is not in the wrong, but has been misapprehended; or, unable to show that such is the case, he no longer persists in misguiding others and deceiving himself, but fairly, frankly, *honestly* acknowledges his hallucination, and unhesitatingly stands out on the side of right.

Again, it may (and *too frequently does*) arise from a *known commission* of it. Under this aspect, it is the effect of a *premeditated intention* to *deceive, mislead*; and this is what constitutes its *sin*. Although the mind is as conscious of the truth as the eye plainly beholds the mid-day sun, yet it refuses to walk therein. No matter how patent the proof of inconsistency with truth, the errorist nevertheless continues his attempts at deception, and may deceive "the very elect themselves." Fully conscious of the guilt of such perversion, no endeavors are made to rebut arguments rightfully, fairly brought against it. A continuance therein—yea, efforts of greater energy—constitute the spirit of the deceptionist.

Who among our fellow-men fall under the former; who under the latter category? It is not for us to say. The Lord trieth the reins and searcheth the hearts of men. Let Him judge. And yet by its fruits we know the tree. A pure, sparkling stream, cannot send from its mouth muddy, turbid waters, and *vice versa*. Men of culture, favored with rational endowments, and, perhaps, claiming some intellectual superiority, cannot, in the very nature of the case, be blinded as to the truth or falsity of certain established fundamentals.

Such as endeavor to palm off the spurious for the true—who call black white, and white black—certainly do so, generally, not through ignorance. Such as run up the *black flag* on board the vessel, and denominate it the "stars and stripes," are certainly not guiltless. Such as fling the "stripes" to the breeze, and practice the principles of the *black flag*, are certainly sailing under false colors; and this not without the knowledge of, *at least, the officers of the crew*. A number of the sailors, placing implicit confidence in the integrity of those in authority over them, may be abettors in the work, not understanding or comprehending the evil they are serving. Men may have ideas—the fabrications of their own unbalanced brains—and advance them to their own hurt and that of others. Lack of knowledge, of proper mental training, give rise to both cause and effect. Men may promulgate views, the machinations of a *self-reproving* conscience. Designed deception is here the cause of the desired effect. Under the semblance of truth, error is practiced. The flag displayed is not indicative of what it covers. There is a sailing under false colors. "Without, ye are like whited sepulchres, fair to look upon; but within, full of all rottenness and dead men's bones."



To some men nature seems to have given but a modicum of veracity. Great economy has been exercised in the distribution. Such men are ever ready to assert what is known by themselves to be false. They hesitate not at declarations founded upon fiction. They cry out "breaking down!" "breaking down!" when they know there is no "breaking down." They cry out *weakness, disorder, confusion*, when there is *strength*, and *constantly increasing strength, unity and harmony*. They cry out "Guerilla!" "Guerilla!" when they themselves are the *skulking, hiding bushwhackers*. To draw attention from their own error, they endeavor, by a hue and cry, to charge error upon others. Stick to the truth, gentlemen—the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Do not sail under false colors.

The course of the Mercersburg-Lancaster party is stamped with inconsistencies throughout. We had almost said it is the very embodiment of an inconsistent conglomeration. They *are* Pantheistic, Romanistic, and of an ultra-Lutheranizing tendency. Of this, one should think they must be well aware. They must also be as well aware of an attempt at blind folding, when they say an attempt has been made to prove that they teach outright Pantheism. They were *never* charged with such Pantheism, Romanism, or ultra-Lutheranism. But they have been and *are* charged with *tendencies* towards each. They are certainly well aware of the distinction between *Pantheistic* and *Pantheism*, *Romanistic* and *Romanism*, *Lutheranistic* and *Lutheranism*. It is an evasion of the question at issue—an attempt to deceive the people—when they claim they are charged with *Pantheism*. They are charged with Pantheizing tendencies. And is the charge not well founded? Does not a *substantial emanation* from the Godhead to man, make him part of Divinity? Have not the Mercersburg-Lancaster party published in a periodical sanctioned by them, that "that life-breath which God breathed forth into Adam when he became a living soul, cannot be regarded otherwise than as an emanation from the being of God?" And is this not *Pantheistic*? If not, what is it?

Again, they are charged with Romanizing tendencies. Have they not again and again advanced and advocated sacerdotalism and a hierarchical priesthood? Have they not expressed themselves in favor of a sacrificial altar? Is this not *Romanistic*? If not, what is it?

Again, they are charged with ultra-Lutheranizing tendencies. If the charge is not well founded, will they please state in what their views of high-churchism *essentially* differ from the ultra-Lutheran?

But they say these things cannot exist together. Truly, it is hard to see how they can, and *form unity*. But, since they do exist together, and that, too, in the Mercersburg-Lancaster party, they (the party), above all others, must be prepared to give a solution to the puzzling problem.

The one tendency does *not* necessarily exclude the other. No one is more fully aware of this than the writer of "Breaking Down," in his organ of March 10th. A Papist may be a Pantheist, (what does the Pope care, so the man but bows to Rome?) a nominal ultra-Lutheran may be both, and it is not inconceivable, especially after reading various articles issuing from the Mercersburg school of late, to suppose that a leader of that school might be all three. Our Lord called the same persons Scribes, Pharisees and hypocrites. And were not the *Sadducees Jews*, and some of them, perhaps, *priests* also?

In standing up for truth against error, it is necessary to change base of operations as frequently as error passes from one point to another. Attacks against one point, instead of not being made good, are only *made too good* for error, and it flees to another. It is necessary truth should follow, and again storm the battlements. Thus have the Mercersburg-Lancaster party been driven from their Pantheistic fort, Romanistic breast work, and their last ditch, virtual ultra-Lutheranism.

*Be candid, gentlemen. Acknowledge your defeat.*

*Truth* is clear, and can always be understood. It is a stream of pure water, so clear that, at its greatest depth, objects upon its pebbly bottom can easily be discerned. *Error* is always clothed in verbiage, dark and shadowy. 'Tis a pool of muddy water. Though but few inches in depth, yet its bottom is not discernible. Those holding errors should not charge that *others* are *finding of fault with the truth*, because the *others* oppose their error. The mystical union of Christ should not be made a mysteriously mystified mystification, or a cloak for an organic conjunction Pantheism; and those who do not receive this Pantheising mystification, should not be denounced as Rationalists.

*When* have they answered *any* objections to their theories "so



clearly and so fully," that all must have seen they were made and could only be "made from a rationalistic stand-point?" When have they defined their position? In what number of the *Messenger* or *Mercersburg Review*? In the "*Reformed Church Monthly*" of February, they were asked to explain terms. Why their silence? Do they assent to the explanations there given of some of their views? If not, why not honestly come out, and, without any shadowy mystification, state what particular scheme of doctrine they do hold?

Gentlemen, do not sail under false colors. It is not honest to do so. It is as perilous as it is wrong. Those who attempt it *may* thus carry their measures for a day. But any such temporary success costs more in the long account than even merely prudent men should be willing to pay. If they have the sense for it, they lose their self-respect. They forfeit the respect and confidence even of many who may agree with their doctrinal views. And, what is still worse, they injure the reputation of Christianity, and give occasion to its enemies to scoff.

J.

---

#### WHAT IT IS.

OUR friends of the Theological Faculty of Lancaster seem to have retired from a frank and straightforward discussion of their peculiar tenets in disgust. Such direct, unequivocal arguments as have been pressed upon them, appear not to suit their taste or schemes. It has not been their style or manner to discuss matters in this unequivocal way.

Some persons may think that they thus decline further discussion, because they are unable to defend themselves against the charges of serious error so openly and directly brought against them; or, because it is thought inexpedient to discuss such matters in their "paper," lest some readers might see that there are two sides to the subject, and find out more about Lancaster theology than it may be well for them to know. This might lead to unpleasant consequences for Lancaster.

On this point every one must judge for himself why the Faculty withdraws so abruptly from the discussion just when it was becom-

ing interesting. Of course, we have our own opinion of the matter. But the case is sufficiently clear, and our opinion could hardly make it clearer.

It will be remembered that in December we had an article under the modest question: *What is It?* It was hoped that article would draw from Lancaster a frank explanation of the pantheising language it has employed from time to time. Instead, however, of meeting the question fairly, Lancaster sought to evade it by turning upon something we wrote many years ago. That artful evasion was met in our last number (page 97). It amounted to a refusal on the part of the Faculty squarely to answer the question, and to an attempt to turn the tables upon us. As said in February, we have not the slightest objection to confront the charge at the right time. That time may come when we have done with the errors of Lancaster. The theology of Ursinus College is open to examination and criticism. It invites it, and will aid the investigation. But matters must not be mixed up and confused. At present we are considering, not Ursinus theology, but Lancaster theology. At Ursinus we do not profess to teach a theology differing from that of the Reformed church. We stand firmly by the old evangelical faith.

Lancaster does not profess to be an exponent of our established Reformed faith. It claims to have gotten above it, or beyond it, or somewhere else at any rate. Its friend, Irenus, brought out this fact pretty fully and bluntly some months ago.

It is, therefore, with Lancaster theology as confessedly different from Reformed, that we are now concerned. And before going to another matter we should settle our dispute on that point.

We are neither afraid nor ashamed to confess our faith even before Lancaster, when the right time for doing so comes. But just now is not the time. At present we have to do with Lancaster theology. Lancaster has openly avowed views which are admitted to be something different from the theology of the Reformed church, based on the standards of her faith. It is, therefore, open to criticism, and ought to be criticised. Lancaster has no right to advocate doctrines varying materially from those of the church, and ought to be held to account for disturbing the peace of the church for doing so.

But to the main point.

This is to show the bearing of the proof-quotations given in our



former article upon the charge that Lancaster theology is pantheistic, and in this respect also not Reformed.

First, let it be remembered that the Lancaster school claims to hold and teach a theology peculiar to itself, at least in this country, one that is more learned, more profound, more philosophical, &c. It claims to be far in advance of other Reformed evangelical schools, &c. We do not admit the claim, but have proven that its developments, so-called, are not developments, in fact, that they are nothing more, in the main, than a mere falling back into errors which Reformed theology has outlived, rejected and condemned.

As, however, Lancaster claims these things, its theologies must be interpreted by its own pretensions. Hence, the terms and the phraseology used by it must be taken in a sense suitable to those pretensions. This must especially be done when it uses words and phrases found in the standard and hitherto generally received theology of the Reformed church. Lancaster says it means something different from the sense in which those words and phrases have been commonly taken, and we accept their statement.

Again. It will be remembered that we have not rested the charge of a pantheistic element in Lancaster theology upon merely one or two questions. Had we done so, they might have justly complained. But we have given a number of quotations, so that Lancaster might explain itself by its own declarations. It has been purposely allowed to be its own interpreter. The quotations were not garbled, nothing was omitted that was necessary to show the meaning of the writers, so far as they told their meaning. This they have virtually acknowledged.

But now, in noticing what we said in proof of our point, Dr. Apple as much as says, that he cannot see in the quotations given anything like the errors charged upon his school! He would like us to show wherein they teach false doctrine.

This may seem, indeed, very much like a man who knows that he is guilty, taking the benefit of demanding a legal proof of it, in the hope that the attempt to furnish the proof may afford him an opportunity to escape conviction. And those who impartially read the quotations we gave, may think that they spoke plainly enough for themselves, and that to demand further evidence is very much like requiring some one to prove that crab-apples are sour, or that quinine is bitter. But as the case is really a serious

one not only for Lancaster, but still more for the church, we shall meet our friend's demand, and try to help him to see (if he is willing to see) what he appears not to have seen hitherto.

The pantheistic error of the Lancaster School is proven :

1. By the *peculiar terms* it employs, as found in the quotations, to set forth its doctrine, and in the peculiar sense in which those terms are plainly used.

Only let any one carefully note those terms, and mark the phraseology in which Lancaster theology delights. Here are some of them :

Christianity is declared to be "*an inward conjunction*" of humanity, or human nature, with God and the divine nature, and this in "*a real*," that is, a *substantial* way.

Then we have this "*inward conjunction*," called an "*organic joining together*" of the two natures, that is, God's and man, so that there is a "*coalescence*" of the two in what Lancaster holds to be the God-man nature of Jesus Christ ; and this organic coalescence is effected, supernaturally, by an "*emanation*" of the substance of God's life or being, over unto man, and through man into created nature at large. In this way it is said that the *two creations*, the material creation described in Genesis, 1st chapter, and the new creation in Christ Jesus, are *organically joined together* in His person." And one great reason for this, we are told, is that, and as an "*organic whole*."

Now, whatever these phrases may really mean, two facts are evident, first, that they are entirely new, strange, and suspicious terms for evangelical Reformed theology. And, secondly, it is evident that the writers who have employed these terms, either used them at random, because they had the appearance of originality and profundity, but without intending to express by them anything radically at variance with Reformed theology ; or those writers used them for the purpose of setting forth a theory of Christianity entirely at variance with that of our hitherto received theology. The very use of phraseology so foreign to the theology, Catechism, and standard works of our church, is strong proof of the latter supposition.

Without giving our Lancaster friends credit for any extraordinary learning or sagacity, it may yet be allowed that they are intelligent enough to know, that they have *borrowed* phraseology for their theory which is warranted by no Reformed standard of



faith, and which cannot be reconciled with the fundamental doctrines of those standards. They have, also, or ought to know where they borrowed their peculiar terms, viz: from writers whom all evangelical theologians of Europe and America regard as pantheistic errorists, in a greater or less degree.

2. Further proof of the charge of this error upon Lancaster theology, is furnished by the *purpose for which it uses those peculiar expressions*. That purpose is, by its own concessions, to make out and establish a certain theory of Redemption. What that theory is, has been declared by those holding and advocating it, and especially in recent articles, in statements so explicit, and even bold, that no room is left for misapprehension. They have declared their views both negatively and positively.

*Negatively*, they have said that their theory utterly repudiates the old Reformed doctrine (and most Scriptural, too,) of Redemption by the vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross. They *cannot* accept of this as the true doctrine of Redemption. With strange inconsistency the reason which they give for not accepting it is, that it seems *contrary to a rational conception of the case!* (Indeed! It seems, then, that these zealous foes of rationalism like well enough to use their own reason when it suits them; but let that pass just now.) Hence, they look somewhere else for the "ground and foundation" of our Redemption. They must find for a philosophy as profound as theirs, a far deeper basis for man's salvation than the "cross of Christ." To them, as to the old philosophers of Greece (who were, by the way, also pantheistic) such a basis for salvation is "foolishness;" that is, something *contemptibly absurd*, something which no true philosopher, according to carnal wisdom, can receive or tolerate in his system. Hence, in the face of repeated declarations of the Heidelberg Catechism, our Lancaster theologians assert (shall we say most audaciously), that it *cannot* mean what it says, and what Ursinus in his Commentary affirms it does mean, and was intended to mean, because such is the plain doctrine of the Gospel.

So, then, the Lancaster Faculty knowingly and intentionally rejects a theory of Redemption which excludes pantheism. Their denial, or negation of our old evangelical doctrine on this vital subject, is a serious thing. It means far more than it may at first seem to mean, and carries fatal consequences with it.

But, leaving this negative aspect of the case for the present,

what do they declare *positively* to be their theory? Abandoning the old foundation, what do they take in its place? They answer, an "*organic redemption.*" This they explain to mean, *a redemption wrought or effected by a real emanation, conjunction, and coalescence of the substance of God into and with the substance of man.* Now, that this clearly and necessarily involves pantheism, was shown in an article written early in June, 1868, (published in the July number of the *Monthly* for that year) and before Dr. Dörner's review of Nevinism had been received. For the substance of God cannot so emanate from His essence and coalesce with the substance of a creature like man (were such a thing conceivable by an evangelical mind and heart) without involving a pantheistic expansion and dissemination of the essence of the Godhead.

This, too, seems to be felt by the Lancaster Faculty itself. Hence their appeal to that passage in St. Peter, which speaks of our being "partakers of the divine nature." Hence their challenge to us to say what that declaration means if it does not mean their doctrine of emanation and coalescence; a challenge, by the way, which will be taken up in due time. They, evidently, interpret the passage as favoring their view, as they do Paul's quotation in Acts, of the words of a heathen poet, that "we are God's offspring."

The case may, therefore, be fairly regarded as made out. The theology of the Lancaster Faculty stands convicted by its own language used over and over again, and by its avowed purpose in using such language, of resting on a philosophy which in its fundamental principle is pantheistic. Starting from such a basis, it is no wonder that the superstructure erected on it should be a tower of Pisa leaning towards Rome.

But where does its Romanism come in? The evidence of this must be reserved for another occasion.



WORK FOR IT.—He that would have the kernel must crack the shell.



THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW AGAINST ITSELF.

CONSISTENCY is a great jewel. It is, however, often hard to hold it fast, especially when the position which men assume is wrong. This has more than once been illustrated by our ritualistic brethren of the East, during the progress of the controversy that has been going on in the church for the last fifteen years. When hard pressed, they have given up their ground and advocated something else. Hence, there has been such a great shifting of position, that it is sometimes hard to tell where they stand.

The Mercersburg Review of January has some striking illustrations of this. More than once, for instance, has odium been attempted to be cast on the Evangelical Alliance. Sometimes one thing was wrong about it, and then another. As a mere voluntary association it could accomplish nothing; it had no power to speak with any authority. Then the subjects to be prayed for were not all right; it was too negative—too much influenced by Puritanism, or Presbyterianism had too much to do with it. In these and similar ways a great deal was said against it.

In a somewhat similar strain does the *Churchman*, a periodical in the service of ritualism, speak of the Alliance. It was composed of a great number of good and learned men, who meant to do right, but were woefully mistaken. The judgment they had about union, contemplating merely a union of spirit and aim, was a mischievous, yea, a most deadly error, the ultimate effects of which are worse than the papacy itself. Any one reading this article of the *Churchman*, cannot help seeing how fully it chimes in with more than one utterance that appeared in the *Reformed Church Messenger* on the same subject. If there is any difference, it is in favor of the *Churchman*, which condescends to speak of the good motives of the leading members of the Alliance.

One cannot help being amazed in opening the *Review* of January, and seeing the severity with which Dr. Nevin deals with the *Churchman*. In his judgment the articles of the *Churchman* has an air of lordliness that is very offensive; it is full of intolerant bitterness and bad humor; the judgment which it fulminated against the Alliance, is uncharitable; a judgment all the more offensive in purpose, as it is but in keeping with much spleen going before on the same subject, and much more of the same kind.

We have no doubt but that the severe criticism which Dr. Nevin here gives of the false position of the *Churchman*, is correct. We have no sympathy with such extremists; but the question naturally arises, Why is it that Dr. Nevin has only *now* given such expressions to his views? Would it not have been better and more consistent if he had long ago so spoken, when Drs. Apple and Gerhart criticised the Alliance in a spirit fully as lordly and intolerant as that of the *Churchman*? And yet all this was allowed to appear in the *Messenger* with no protest. Or are we to suppose that he has changed his views of this respectable body since he read a paper before it, as did others, which paper is now published with its proceedings.

We are glad, however, that it *has* come, even though it be late; and we only hope those who spoke as they did in the *Messenger*, will take the rebuke, although it reaches them over the back of the *Churchman*. But the master and the pupils are here evidently on different sides, unless the latter have seen the error of their ways and repented. We would suggest that the Editor of the *Messenger* transfer so much of the article of Dr. Nevin as relates to the Alliance to his columns. We have no doubt but that many of his readers would thank him for it, and be glad to see such a vindication of the Alliance against the censures of self-constituted critics.

Another inconsistency in the Review of January, is found in the articles of Dr. C. P. Krauth reviewing Dr. Hodge's Theology. It is true the Editor disclaims all responsibility for the positions taken by Dr. Krauth; but then is it not palpably true that the views which he presented as those of the Reformed church, are in direct opposition to those that have been so persistently advocated by our Mercersburg and Lancaster friends on the subject of baptism. The readers of this periodical know full well that one of its main positions has been that, Dr. Nevin and his school have fallen from the old doctrine of the Reformed church on the subject of baptism, and have substituted a fiction of their own. Of this there cannot be the slightest doubt. It is, indeed, astonishing that the Editor would allow such an array and accumulation of historical evidence as Dr. Krauth brings forward from the Confessions, and most representative men of the Reformed and Presbyterian churches, that would be in such flat contradiction of what he and others have so often said on the subject of baptism. It is



only a few days ago that an article appeared in the *Messenger* from the pen of one of the professors at Lancaster, criticising the Presbyterians, and advocating that membership in the church is constituted by baptism. How the readers of the *Mercersburg Review* can ever hereafter believe what it has so persistently taught about the objective power of the Sacraments, baptismal regeneration, membership by baptism, and, in the face of what Dr. Krauth here declares with a great show of testimony to have been the faith of the Reformed and Presbyterian church, we are at a loss to see.

With the special use Dr. Krauth makes of these quotations, and the way in which he endeavors to make it appear that the Reformed and Presbyterian churches held certain views which they repudiate, we have no sympathy. This, however, does not invalidate the truth of these testimonies in reference to many points in dispute amongst us in regard to the subject of baptism.

We may well ask what becomes of Dr. Gerhart's labored article in the *Review* some years ago, in which he endeavored to show that the Mercersburg speculations were confirmed by all the Confessions of the Reformed church. Surely, the mountains labored and brought forth a —. We will here give a few of these quotations:

"The children of believers who are born in the church, are of the household of the kingdom of God." "Why should not they be consecrated by holy baptism who *are* God's peculiar people, and *in* the church of God." "The baptism of water is not, therefore, absolutely necessary to the reconciliation of the infant and its reception into grace, inasmuch as the reconciliation precedes the baptism." "The opinion of Reformed theologians is known to be, that *the efficacy of baptism is not in producing regeneration, but in sealing regeneration already produced.*" We would not baptize little children unless we supposed that they *already* belonged to the church and Christ." "Unless they are to be esteemed as members of the church, they ought not to be baptized. For baptism is, in its own nature, the seal of an ingrafting *already made* into Christ, and consequently into His church." "Seeing that together with the parents, God doth account their posterity to be *of the church*, we affirm, that infants being born of holy parents are . . . to be baptized." "Children of believers are, indeed, by virtue of the covenant, holy before baptism; but baptism comes in, as it were, a seal of holiness." "The principle

is constantly to be maintained, that baptism does not confer on infants the becoming sons and heirs of God, but because they are already esteemed in that place, and in that rank before God; the grace of adoption is sealed in their flesh by baptism." "All infants of Christians, even before baptism, are holy, with a federal and external holiness, on account of which they ought to be reputed a part of the visible church and the people of God, and as federates be admitted to the seal of the covenant. Some infants of Christians, even before baptism may, even in their mother's womb, not, indeed, by nature, but by grace, are holy with an internal sanctity, and these infants are believers and regenerate." "The children of Christians are born in the covenant, and are citizens of the church."

The Heidelberg Catechism, Dr. Krauth tells us, rests on the same view. "Young children \* \* \* by baptism are separated from the children of unbelievers. Ursinus says: All those, and those alone, are to be baptized who are disciples of Christ; that is, who are and who ought to be considered members of the visible church."

Now, who will say that the doctrine here taught as that of the Reformed church, is what Mercersburg and Lancaster teach? Will Drs. Nevin, Apple, Gerhart and Rev. Rupp say that this is what they hold and teach? They know, as well as we do, and as Dr. Krauth does, that it is not. And yet the views here presented are those that have always prevailed in our church, as we and others have shown. Upon this point there ought to be no dispute.

Hear what Dr. Krauth again says on this point: "The Confession has one sense only; this sense is to be fixed by the acknowledged principles of interpretation; the natural sense of the words as they impress the minds of readers, is *ceteris parabis*, to be accepted in preference to any other; in case of dispute as to their meaning, the different parts of the Confession are to be composed with reference to the light they shed on each other; if opinions still differ as the sense, the usage of the authors of the Confession of the great divines of the church, and of their successors, the official and sworn teachers and defenders of the faith are to be appealed to, to show how the words were understood by those who used them, by those who subscribed them, and by the church in general—and what is the sense most in harmony with the logical necessities and completeness of the system, as its



defenders have thought themselves, understood them. \* \* \* The meaning of a Confession when it is made, remains its meaning forever, and hence the vital importance of the earliest writers, the authors of confessions, and the original interpreters, expounders and defenders of them."

If we try the Mercersburg-Lancaster speculations, for such they are at best, by the rule here laid down, they cannot stand for a moment. They are innovations in the Reformed church, and the sooner our people come to know it, the better it would be for all concerned. It is truly cheering that the church is coming, even though it is late, to a right understanding of this. Our people are seeing it in a light they never did before.

The recent work of Rev. Dr. Schneck, one of our oldest and most widely known ministers, will also contribute no little to bring the church to a consciousness of her doctrines and life. This book ought to be circulated far and wide. It is just what our people need. The only pity is, that it did not come sooner. But God will take care of His own cause. Truth will yet triumph over every form of error.

The readers of this periodical will also recollect how fully the rule here laid down by Dr. Krauth for determining the historical faith of any church, accords with what those of us who have opposed the new theology, have said over and over again, and when we did so, what a cry was made *about repristination*. More than one article was written by Dr. Apple and published in the *Reformed Messenger* against the repristination of the Reformation period. And yet Dr. Krauth has sixty pages given him in the *Review*, in which he applies the very same test to prove that Dr. Hodge does not represent the faith of Presbyterians. We will now ask, has Dr. Krauth been guilty of wanting to lift the Presbyterian church, as it was two hundred years ago, out of the position it then occupied, and make it fit in the present state of things without any regard to the advance that has been made during the intervening period? Or has Dr. Apple changed his mind about repristination? Or it may be that the trying of the Presbyterian church by this rule does not hit him with as much force as when it was applied to the Reformed church. At any rate, is it not desirable to republish some of the articles he wrote on repristination? Verily, the *Review* is here waging war against itself.

G. W. W.

## DOUBTFUL MORALITY.

THIS serious topic, especially in its church bearings, is suggested by an article in a paper which persists in the motto, "*Mittelmass die beste Strass.*" In general terms, *the occasion* of the article, as presented by said paper, is as follows :

A distinguished minister of one denomination accepted a call from a congregation of another denomination. He was duly received by the second denomination, solemnly signed the usual formula, or oath, by which he bound himself and his ministrations to all proper fidelity to the faith and the interests of the denomination which received him. He was accordingly installed as pastor of the congregation to which he had been called, and entered upon his work. In this relation, under such solemn pledges, he continued several years. Not long ago, however, as it is stated, he left this second denomination, returned to that from which he had come, and took the congregation, property, and all with him.

This is pronounced a flagrant case of immorality, something akin to robbery or treason. "*Mittelmass*" is fired with indignation at it, and cannot keep down a boiling sense of its heinous wrong. And from the way the case is put, it has, indeed, a very bad face, and seems to call for reprobation. This we felt, and quite as keenly as "*Mittelmass.*"

But, by a very familiar law of thought, one thing brings to mind another, and this again another, leading the thoughts quite away from the matter first presented. So this particular case, over which *Mittelmass* grew so indignant, and about the gross wrong of which he could write so earnestly, set us to thinking about some other things of the same sort, only far worse in their character and consequences. And, after thinking about these worse things awhile, we wondered whether "*Mittelmass*" did not think of them, too, whilst writing his condemnation of the case he had in hand.

There are things of far more account to the church sanctuaries than brick or stone, and mortar, or even than individual members and congregations. A church can be more deeply wounded, and more flagrantly wronged in other ways than by the loss of such property, or by reducing its material strength. To steal anything



is a crime. And yet whoever "steals a purse, steals trash," in comparison with what he might steal. So whoever, by doubtfully honest, or by openly dishonest means, defrauds a church of its property or members, is guilty of a gross wrong. But, evidently, he might do far worse things by staying in the church and utterly perverting its property from its intended, legitimate use, by decoying its members from the truth into dangerous errors, and in other ways.

Here is a point which "Mittelmass" seems to have strangely overlooked. And yet he could hardly keep it from coming into his mind.

"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." And of this a proof and illustration may often be seen in its attempts to quiet conscience for covering up a greater sin by railing terribly at another. It will go into a holy spasm of indignation at "the mote in a brother's eye," as an excuse for utterly overlooking the beam in its own eye. This is a notable phenomenon.

Let us follow it up a little with one or two appropriate illustrations.

*First.* Doctrines have always been regarded as an essential part of the life of a church. To have and maintain a pure gospel faith has ever been considered one of the most important and sacred duties of the church. This is felt and admitted especially in regard to such doctrines as are fundamental. What doctrines are so, is generally stated in plain terms and understood.

To maintain and guard this faith, its articles, or the doctrines composing it, are clearly set forth in a creed, confession, or catechism, which the church adopts and publishes as its standard of truth, according to the scriptures, which are the ultimate and only supreme rule of faith. It also provides in its constitution against any perversion of this faith, or introduction of doctrines contrary to it, by requiring its members, ministers and teachers solemnly to declare that they hold the faith of the church, and that as long as they remain in the church they will embrace and teach no views contrary to that faith, but try by all suitable means to uphold and defend it.

How much depends upon doing honestly and faithfully what is thus required, will be evident to all who give the matter serious thought. That any member, or minister, or teacher of the

church, who in the face of all this would attempt to undermine, or pervert, or essentially to change the doctrines of a church, would be guilty of a great offence, an offence far worse than if they should try to alienate some church property, must be manifest. Bad as this would be, the other would be far worse. The faith of a church, or of its members, is and should be far dearer to them than all the church buildings and property it may possess combined. It is easier to build new churches than to restore a lost faith.

What shall be said, then, of those in a church who may be using whatever influence and ability they may have in undermining and subverting the old faith, and that in its most vital points, and who may be devoting themselves with most untiring energy and zeal to the work of introducing doctrines utterly at variance with essential doctrines of the church? Can such a course be pronounced right! Does not such conduct present a case, not of doubtful morality only, but of indubitable immorality? And suppose, further, this is done under the cover and pretence of mere development, or that it is only carrying out the old faith to a higher and more advanced point. Does that lessen or increase the wrong?

If, in addition to this, some paper circulating in the church should take those guilty of this wrong under its wing; should defend them, and conceal, in part, their efforts, or try to make people believe that they meant no harm, were doing nothing contrary to fidelity to the church, nothing to subvert the faith, but that they were grossly misrepresented by those who might accuse them of any thing of the sort. Would such a paper be chargeable with an act, a course of doubtful morality? Suppose, also, the paper would try to conceal facts from the church, would let only one side be heard in the case, and would grossly denounce the other side, and try to excite all sorts of personal prejudices against them, without ground, would that be as bad as for some party to steal church property, or would it be worse? Would it involve deceit and treachery, and virtual falsehood, in the most reprehensible forms?

Alas! that there should be any occasion for such a comparison, or for such questions? A *second* illustration might be drawn in a similar way, from efforts to change the worship of a church. But let the above suffice.



SHOULD PROFESSORS IN A REFORMED SEMINARY  
ADVOCATE AND TEACH REFORMED, OR  
LUTHERAN DOCTRINE?

THIS is a very strange question to ask, especially when it is remembered that such professors are required to take a solemn oath to teach Reformed doctrine according to the Heidelberg Catechism. Yet the *Doctrine of Baptism*, as advocated by the Mercersburg men, is *certainly not the old Reformed doctrine*, but comes fully up to that of the Lutherans (old school), or goes even beyond that, to the confines of Romanism. And yet there are men disingenuous enough (or else ignorant enough) to pretend that the Mercersburg doctrine is *genuine old Reformed doctrine*.

In some inscrutable way, the *editor* of the *Mercersburg Review* admitted into its last number an article by Dr. Krauth, which the editor praises highly, *but which fully proves, by new evidences*, what the opponents of Mercersburg have all along affirmed (and established by incontestible historical evidence), namely, that the Mercersburg doctrine of baptism is *anti-Reformed*.

Let us, therefore, be very thankful to Dr. Apple for inserting said article. Both his old Lutheran friends, Dr. Fritschel and Dr. Krauth, have now fully proven that his doctrine of baptism "is more Lutheran than Reformed." In his eagerness to make a point against Dr. Hodge on a subordinate point, he prints an article *which utterly upsets all claim of Mercersburg to be in agreement with the old Reformed faith*. No wonder Dr. Russell and other friends are *in astonishment* at the appearance of that article in the *Review*. After having argued for years that Mercersburg doctrine is no departure from Reformed doctrine, to find all this upset through the industry of Dr. Krauth, in the pages of the *Review*, too, is *really too bad*. Under the circumstances they deserve our sympathy.

Permit me to give an extract from a letter of a minister, educated at Mercersburg and Lancaster, a subscriber to the *Review*, to show how that article has helped to open the eyes of some. He says:

"In the last number of the *Mercersburg Review*, Dr. Krauth takes the whole of them (the Mercersburg school) into the Lutheran church, and tells them that the old Reformed Confession and theolo-

*gians never held any such views of the baptism of infants as are now taught at Lancaster. IF ONLY ALL IN THE REFORMED CHURCH WOULD READ THAT ARTICLE."*

If the *Reformed Church Monthly* can spare the space, it would be well to republish as much of this article as possible, so as to bring these *new proofs* before a wider circle of readers.

CRITICAL OBSERVER.

As far as the point so well made against Lancaster theology by "Observer" requires it, and our limits allow, we cheerfully furnish the quotations from *Dr. Krauth's article* called for. That article, it will be understood, is meant to be a most elaborate argument against the Reformed doctrine of infant baptism and infant salvation, as set forth by Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, in his recently published and very able work, entitled "Systematic Theology," or more strictly against what Dr. Hodge declares to be the Reformed doctrine on the subject. Dr. Krauth lays out all his strength (and in most respects he is by far the ablest theologian in his branch of the Lutheran church in this country, besides being personally a most estimable gentleman) to prove, historically and confessionally, that the Reformed church holds a doctrine concerning infant baptism and salvation, which Dr. Hodge affirmed is not held by the Reformed church. That Dr. Hodge is right, and Dr. Krauth is wrong, is our own persuasion, notwithstanding the long array of citations made by Dr. Krauth to show the contrary. But, with the argument as between those two gentlemen, we have nothing to do here. Our present purpose is, in accordance with the suggestion of "Observer," to let the readers of the "*Monthly*" see how Dr. Krauth proves incidentally, by his citations from Reformed theology and Confessions, *what the Reformed doctrine of baptism, especially as related to regeneration, is*, and that the Lancaster theology, on this point, differs most essentially from that of the Reformed church, and is utterly irreconcilable with it. In other words, Dr. T. G. Apple, or those whom he represents, allows an article to appear in their *Review*, which demonstrates that their doctrine of baptismal regeneration is in no sense Reformed, whatever else it may be. And they allow this to be done in a way calculated to excite bitter and unjust prejudices against the doctrine of the Reformed church on the subject. They are under solemn bonds to defend the doctrines of the Reformed church, and yet they allow them to be at least covertly assailed.

They may say: Dr. Hodge is a *Presbyterian*, not Reformed. They ought to know, however, that the Presbyterian church is a branch and integral part of the Reformed church. This fact they once knew, and they rejoiced in it, as the following quotation from Dr. J. W. Nevin's Inaugural Address clearly shows. He there says:

"The Reformed church of Scotland and the Reformed church of Germany, as well as the Reformed church of Holland and the Reformed church of France, are so many twin-sisters by birth, not merely of the Protestant Reformation, but of that Reformation in its purest form, as it was finally perfected at Geneva, under the instrumentality of the gigantic spirit of Calvin. The Heidelberg



*Should Professors in a Ref'd Seminary, &c.* 211

Catechism, drawn up in the sixteenth century, may be regarded as *the groundwork, doctrinally, on which the Westminster Confession of Faith was erected the century following. Both churches stand on the German platform, as to faith.* Both are formed on the same *Presbyterian* plan of government. In no sense do they constitute different religious *sects*, according to the proper use of that term. *They constitute in this country substantially one and the same interest, and should feel themselves bound together by an unceasing mutual sympathy of the most active sort.*

Such Dr. J. W. Nevin solemnly declared to be his views when he came into our church in 1840. How do Dr. Apple and Lancaster like them now? Surely, after so explicit and really true a statement of the close relationship between the two churches, it will hardly do for Dr. Apple's ultra-Lutheran prejudices to read Dr. Hodge out of the Reformed church.

[But we proceed to the quotations from Dr. Krauth's article, showing, as said, the wide and radical difference between Lancaster theology and the Reformed faith on the subject of baptism and regeneration. In each case the name of the Reformed theologian or Confession, cited by Dr. Krauth, is given.]—*Ed. Monthly.*

*Calvin.* "The children of believers, who are born in the church, we say are of the household of the kingdom of God, \* \* (and, therefore,) are not to be defrauded of the outward sign."

*Zanchius.* "All are to be baptized who, on account of the piety of the parents, are believed to belong to the covenant,"

*Paræus.* "The children of Christians are born Christians, as the children of Jews are born Jews." "They are born in the covenant and are citizens of the church." "The infants of Christians are citizens of the church, are born in the covenant, with federal (covenant) grace; as citizens are born of citizens, the free are born of the free, and slaves are born of slaves."

*Molinaeus.* "The baptism of water is not, therefore, absolutely necessary to the reconciliation of the infant and its reception into grace, inasmuch as the reconciliation precedes the baptism."

*Voetius.* "THE OPINION OF THE REFORMED THEOLOGIAN IS KNOWN, THAT THE EFFICACY OF BAPTISM IS NOT IN PRODUCING REGENERATION, BUT IN SEALING REGENERATION ALREADY PRODUCED."

[Dr. Apple would do well to commend this last quotation to the notice of the estimable author of the article he published in January, 1873, showing that regeneration is by baptism, and assuming this to be Reformed doctrine. Anywhere else but in the history of Nevinism, it would be strange that two such contradictory articles should appear in his *Review* just one year apart.]—*Ed. Monthly.*

Under another paragraph Dr. K. proceeds to show that, according to Reformed theology,

"Grace in no sense waits on baptism, but baptism on grace: Baptism is not a means of grace (that is, of regenerating grace.—*Ed. Monthly*), but grace is a means of real baptism; in the Calvinistic (that is, Reformed.—*Ed.*) system *we are baptized, not in order to obtain grace, but because we are already supposed to have it.*"

To prove that this is Reformed doctrine, Dr. K. then gives about two pages of quotations from Calvin, Martyr, the former Helvetic Confession, Rivetus, Ames, the Zurich Consensus, the Heidelberg Catechism Question 72, Bodius, Witsius and Heppo. Under another head he cites

*Bullinger*, as asserting: "The kingdom of Heaven is of infants. No one is received into the kingdom of heaven unless he be the friend of God: and these are not destitute of the Spirit of God. Children are Gods; therefore, they have the Spirit of God. Therefore, if they have received the Holy Ghost as well as we; if they be accounted among the people of God as well as we that be grown of age, who can forbid these to be baptized with water in the name of the Lord?"

*Ursinus*, explaining the answer to Question 74 of the Heidelberg Catechism (as given in the *Corpus Doctrinal*, 1612, p. 441), says: "All they, and they alone are to be baptized, who are disciples of Christ, whether they be adults professing faith and repentance, or be infants born in the church; for all the children of the faithful are in the covenant, and in the church of God, unless they exclude themselves."

[Thus we might go on giving Dr. Krauth's citations to the same effect. But we must stop somewhere, and as our space is limited, and the above specimens abundantly prove our point, we stop here. The moral effect, however, of all this array of testimony, will not stop. It does, indeed, simply confirm what the *Monthly* has often declared and proven. But it confirms it in a singularly emphatic way. In view of the above, "*Observer*" might well raise the question at the head of his brief article. How will our church answer that question?]  
—*Ed. Monthly.*

---

## Ursinus College Repertory.

---

[AMONG the addresses delivered at the recent anniversary of the *Zwinglian Literary Society*, an account of which will be found below, the following by *A. E. Dahlman*, of the Senior Class, will be read with special interest, for the firm ground it takes in favor of the Christian element in education. The other addresses spoken, will be published in course.]—ED. MONTHLY.

### THE TRUE IDEA OF EDUCATION.

Man is the crown of creation. Physically considered, he is the culmination and perfection of the kingdom of nature. His mind proclaims him to be the



destined master and lord of the earth, and his whole spiritual being raises him far above the world to God, and manifests his divine origin and destiny. And yet, although every other created being is there, with reference to him, and he stands infinitely above it, at his entrance into this world he is the most helpless of all God's creatures. The young of animals are left to provide for themselves shortly after they have been brought forth, and grow up uncared for by the parents. But man comes into this world a tender, helpless babe, wholly dependent for his existence during the first years of his life, on those around him. This state of helpless infancy, however, already manifests his relation to the world. For, whilst the plant grows from the germ, and produces flowers and seed, under the action of the plastic power, and whilst the animal lives and acts under the blind impulse of instinct, man, endowed with consciousness, reason and will, is left to become conscious, by his own activity, of the laws, condition and end of his being; become conscious of the world, and, by his own determination, to act in harmony with, or in opposition to, his being. He comes into the world utterly helpless, with all the faculties and energies of his soul, as it were, slumbering in embryo. When the outside world first awakens these sleeping energies, through the senses, and the soul itself struggles to break through the mist and clouds which encompass it, then the spirit, for the first time, asserts its destined mastery over the world. And when, still later, the full light of consciousness dawns upon the soul, and reason manifests itself, then the process of education or development has commenced, which, if rightly carried out, will end in man's realization of himself, not only as the crown of creation, but as the image of God, destined for an immortality in communion with God Himself.

The term education is very common, but many who use it, scarcely have a clear idea of what it means. To educate (meaning literally to draw forth) already implies something which is hidden, and which must be drawn out of its depths, that it may become manifest. Man, as an immortal spirit, bearing the impress of God, has hid within his deep recesses an exhaustless store of natural gifts and faculties, which it is his highest duty and prerogative to unfold and to bring to light, or, in other words, to make his own conscious possession. As man, in physical culture, subjects the world to his control, and employs the powers and forces of nature to do his bidding, and to minister to his comfort and advancement, so, in education, he becomes master of the faculties and hidden depths of his own nature, in obedience to the imperative claims of his spirit to its highest development. These heaven-born powers and faculties of his spirit may all be embraced under the three heads of knowing, feeling and willing. These are so many, although different, still always harmoniously and organically combined, forms of the activity of the soul. Man cannot know, without being at the same time willing to know, and being emotionally affected in some way by that which is known. He can have no feeling or emotion without knowing something of that which occasions the emotion. Every emotion influences the will, and incites to action; and every action reacts on our feeling, and makes that formerly single and momentary emotion more permanent, and a greater incentive to action; so that, by frequent repetitions of the same act, a permanent state of feeling is caused, and habit is formed. Man

likewise cannot will anything, without at the same time knowing something of it; and his will cannot go out into action, unless moved by his feeling, and having a reaction again on his emotional nature. So, in every act of the spirit, these three forms of activity are combined; and as one or the other has the greater prominence, we say that we know, or we feel, or we will. Now, education is the process of becoming masters, of acquiring conscious possession of ourselves, as knowing, willing, and feeling agents. This is done by realizing in our souls the true, the good and the beautiful. These three positive forms of being answer respectively to our knowing, willing, and feeling powers; and, like these, are always inseparable—the one or the other, however, in particular cases, predominating over the rest. Any object engaging the spirit's activity, according as its prominent features are the true, or the beautiful, or the good, will call forth preëminently the intellectual, or the emotional, or the ethical activity of the spirit. And education, the development and mastery of our whole, in its truest and deepest sense, is *the realization of the true, the good and the beautiful in our souls.*

The intelligence, the mind of man, the reflection of the divine mind, contains his noblest and most exalted faculties. Yet these do not exist for him, unless he has unfolded, developed them, and in this way has removed the veil behind which they were concealed, and become conscious and master of them. As the plant is contained in embryo in the seed, so these are at first slumbering in the soul; and as when the seed is buried in the soil, and subjected to the necessary condition of moisture and warmth, under the influence of the plastic power, that which was contained in possibility in the germ, is unfolded, is realized, and becomes manifest; so those hidden faculties of the mind, possessed by each individual to a greater or less degree, if brought under the right conditions, will be unfolded and realized. In the former case, however, the realization is external, and takes place by means of a blind power, acting under certain laws and conditions. But, in the latter case, the conscious spirit itself unfolds those intellectual powers formerly unknown to itself, and in this way becoming fully conscious of them, it makes them a reality for itself, and acquires the mastery over them. Man develops his intellectual faculties *by employing them upon their proper object*, which is *objective truth* in all its forms. This is true study. The full apprehension of the truth is knowledge, or, in other words, *it is the full correspondence between thinking and being.* By the acquisition of knowledge, being, in its different forms, is affected or imaged in the mind. When this mental concept or image of any kind of being completely corresponds with its outer reality, then we have acquired *the truth* in reference to it; we have made it our own. We not merely possess it, as something foreign to ourselves, but have made it a part of our own intellectual being. As the plant assimilates the moisture, the carbonic acid, and the elements of the soil, to its own nature, and reproduces them under the form of roots, stems and leaves, and is thus built up and developed; so the mind assimilates the truth which it has acquired to itself, and in this way its faculties are more and more unfolded. Thus, by the realization of the truth in his own intellect, man's mental powers and faculties are unfolded—he arrives to a full consciousness of them, and acquires the mastery of his own intellectual world.



This realization of the truth in our minds, as it constitutes our intellectual education, involves, at the same time, the realization of the good in our souls, constituting the unfolding and mastery, the education of our will. By willing, we determine ourselves in relation to being. We may conceive either of a self-determination of man, contrary to being, in which case there will be a disharmony between being and himself; or of his determining himself in a manner corresponding with being, in which case the *highest good* should be realized. *This correspondence of being with our self-determination, in relation to it, is the right.* Now, we have completely mastered and educated our will, when *this is fully in accordance with the right.* Then we will be in harmony with being, and the *good* will be realized in our souls. If this could be fully accomplished by our own efforts, it would be necessary that we regulate our will by the right, as the standard; and to do this it would be necessary that we recognize the right. But we could only recognize the truth either from a preëxisting harmony of being with ourselves, from which we could deduce what it is, or by an innate faculty or intuition which we possess, which gives us the knowledge of it. But a harmony of being with ourselves preësupposes and is conditioned by the recognition of this, right; and, hence, to derive the right from this is an absurdity. An innate faculty would consequently be necessary, which could only be conscience; and this, in order to perceive the right, must be *the consciousness of God in our souls, as the One from whom all being springs, by whom all being is conditioned, and in whom all being centres.* If man were in his normal state, his whole being would be pure, his actions would be right—there would be no disharmonies between him and being. In this condition *his consciousness of God would determine his consciousness of himself, and would be the basis of his self-determination in relation to being;* that is, while conscious of himself, he would at the same time be conscious of God, as Him in whom he lives and moves, and has his being—as the source and centre of all being. Hence, he would spontaneously recognize the right; his will would be in harmony with the right; he would act accordingly, and there would be no disharmonies in the world.

But man is not pure—his actions are not right—he does not determine himself in accordance with being, but has created a perfect disharmony in the world, and in his own soul. Is this so because he cannot at all recognize the right, and is sailing at random on the sea of life? It is because, on account of the fall, his consciousness of God no more determines his consciousness of himself; the two are separated; the latter prevails, to which the former is subordinate; that is, his consciousness of himself rests in itself; it determines his being—he becomes an end to himself, more or less independently of God. But his consciousness of God is not entirely lost. The tie which binds him to his Creator, although it be but by a single fibre, is still not broken. The possibility of being restored to full communion and fellowship with his God is still left; he still has a conscience. The degree to which the consciousness of God is still found in him, is greater or smaller, as his self-consciousness is more or less absorbed by itself. According to this, the culture of his will will be higher or lower, although, as long as man is in this condition, it will always be deficient and imperfect. Now, that his will be in harmony with the right, that the

highest good be realized, it is necessary that the right relation of our self-consciousness to our consciousness of God be restored, so that, in being conscious of ourselves, we are also conscious of God, as our source, centre, and end, as well as that of all being. For this, Christianity provides a way—it completely answers all our wants, and has fully authenticated itself during the nineteen centuries of its existence. Since, therefore, Christianity alone provides that which is necessary for the highest and the only true unfolding of our will, it must follow that Christianity is necessary for the realization of the good in our souls. And this is necessary, and is involved in the highest intellectual education, the realization of the truth in our minds. For this can only be completely accomplished *when our thinking fully corresponds with being*. But, inasmuch as our thinking, our concept of being, must be incomplete unless we know the author of being, and can thus view it in its deepest relations, obtain all its marks and attributes—the highest intellectual development cannot be attained unless we learn to know God as the One from whom, creatively, all being springs, in whom all being centres, as Him in whom we live, and move, and have our being. This knowledge of God, however, is impossible, unless we have been brought into full and true communion and fellowship with Him; in other words, unless the good be realized in us, which Christianity effects.

The development and mastery—the education—of ourselves, as knowing and willing beings, by the realization of the true and the good in our souls, *is only possible on the basis of the realization of the beautiful in our spirit, the cultivation and refinement of our emotional nature*. Man, having departed from God by the fall, became the creature of sin and the tool of his passions. The divine part of his being yielded more and more to that which was from the earth, until it was almost buried in the dust which God had organized to become the habitation of the immortal soul he breathed into it. So we often find man yet at the present day in the savage and barbarous state, his animal nature wholly predominant over the spirit, and he standing but little above the brute. But he cannot remain in this condition. From an inherent want of their nature men associated; society was organized, and the spirit awoke to a vague consciousness of its nobility and high origin, and strove mightily to break the fetters by which the animal nature had encompassed and bound it. It did assert its dignity and curb this animal nature to a certain extent. Intelligence spread, the emotions became more elevated and noble, more spiritual, the soul presented to itself higher and nobler ideals, and strove to realize them more and more; the arts and sciences flourished so that some productions of that age are still unsurpassed. But with all this the ancients only raised themselves to a certain height, and when this had been reached, the downward course began and swiftly brought them to the grossest sensuality and effeminacy. And why? The emotional nature of man and his will are not based on his intellectual nature, but the reverse is the fact. The feelings may be brought to a certain stage of refinement by intelligence, but they can never be raised above gratification of self. This may not be sensual, but spiritual gratification. Man's consciousness of himself determines his being; his consciousness of God is subordinate to it and almost completely absorbed by it, hence his feelings can at the best be but selfish. But when Christianity comes in and restores the



right relation of his consciousness of God to his self-consciousness, so that the former determines the latter, then he becomes susceptible of the truly beautiful, his selfishness becomes self-devotedness, his ideas are the highest and purest, his feelings are pleasurably excited by the truly beautiful and noble. That which formerly caused gratification will cause abhorrence, and his emotional nature has been brought into harmony with the objectively noble and beautiful—it has been beautiful. Now the will is for the first time brought into harmony with the right, for feeling or emotion in man is the incentive of the will and determines the character. Our will does not go out into action unless moved by the feelings; hence the nature of our emotions will determine the nature of our acts; and if, therefore, our emotional nature be impure and wrong, we will determine ourselves contrary to being, our actions will be sinful and base; while on the other hand, if our feelings be ennobled and beautified, our will is brought into harmony with the right, our actions will be good, the good will be realized in us. And since, as was seen before, the realization of the good in our souls is the basis of true and high intellectual development, the realization of the beautiful in our spirit, which Christianity effects, is the basis of the true mastery of the will and development of the mind.

Thus when our being has been beautified and ennobled, and the good and true realized in it, then we have become fully conscious and master of our nature; the highest education has been acquired. But our nature is the bond which unites us with the world of matter and spirit around about us. It is the ground of resonance in which the different tones of the life of the world *rêecho*. Education involves, therefore, a general susceptibility for the great riches of nature and spirit-life which present themselves to our soul, for everything which is significant for human life. But the more the different tones of the world's life *rêecho* in our soul, the better will we perceive and the more will our inner life be affected and moved by the shrill discords which mar the harmony of the world, the inner struggles and strifes, the yearnings and hopes, in short the whole tragedy of life. And the more will the spirit soar beyond this reality to God in Christ, in whom all these discords are resolved, who is the truth, the highest good and beauty, until resting and abiding fully in Him, man's being will be in perfect and in the sweetest harmony.

Thus as Christianity is necessary to true education, so as this education becomes higher in degree, it involves a fuller and more intimate communion with God; and the highest education will be acquired when our highest destiny will be reached, beyond the grave.

A. E. D.

---

ZWINGLIAN LITERARY SOCIETY.

THE evening of the 26th day of March, 1874, brought with it the anniversary of the Zwinglian Literary Society.

It was held in Ursinus chapel. The chapel was beautifully decorated for the occasion with evergreens.

The music, which was good, was furnished by a well trained orchestra of Pottstown.

The opening prayer was delivered in a sweet and impressive manner by Rev. Professor Henry W. Super.

The exercises consisted of a Salutatory, four English and one German oration. The Salutatorian chose the subject, "Our Country," on which he spoke some six minutes. He then concluded with words of welcome to the Faculty, the Sister Society, and the audience.

Following this were three English orations, on two subjects: "The Divine and Human," "How Things are Measured," and "Influence of Habit on Moral Character." The subject of the German oration was, "The Study of the Latin and the Greek Languages;" and that of the Zwinglian oration, "Education."

The general appearance of the speakers indicated attention to elocution. The step and position on the stage, gestures, intonation of voice and accent, manifested careful drill.

The subject matter of all was marked by a fine Christian spirit. The thoughts were finely moulded, and claimed attention by their intrinsic worth. In some instances it was original, in some unique, and always well applied.

The orations were not without method. A plan in each case was manifest. The introduction in every instance limned out the speech. The body contained the necessary illustrations, and the conclusion restated the whole. There was in all, also a freshness which is only found possessed by ingenuous youth. Flowers and blushing fruits mingled in profusion. There was present, too, an eloquence of thought and word, and every figure or pictured example was veiled in beauty. In the very classification of the pieces on the programme was a notable merit.

They were so placed as to cause a natural climax. The Salutatory was pretty; the first oration beautiful; the second oration was ingenious; the third powerful; the German oration was elegant, and the Zwinglian loomed over all by its wider range and more etherial nature.

Again have the young men of Ursinus done well for their cherished mother. This time the credit is due to members of the Zwinglian Literary Society.

R.

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

THE *sad calamity* referred to in the resolutions below, occurred at a house in the vicinity of the College. The estimable young man who was summoned so suddenly into eternity, was the son of the Rev. H. A. Hunsicker, former proprietor of Freeland Seminary. He was a member of a lodge of Good Templars established in Freeland, but in no way connected with Ursinus College,



and in union with a number of other members of the lodge, was practicing for a dramatic exhibition by which it was hoped to serve the cause of temperance. One part of the drama involved the use of a pistol, which was not thought to be loaded. On firing it off, however, it proved the fatal instrument of the young man's death. The mournful event has cast the community into all the deeper gloom, from the high regard cherished by all for young Mr. Hunsicker and his afflicted family, and sympathy for the innocent occasion of the calamity. No responsibility, of course, rests with the College in the case.

URSINUS COLLEGE, March 18, 1874.

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D.—

Sir: The Freshman class of our college ask as a favor of you, to publish the following "resolutions of respect" in the *Church Monthly*:

*Resolutions of Respect.*

At a meeting of the Freshman class of Ursinus College, February 24, a committee was appointed on resolutions of respect on the death of a highly esteemed member. The committee reported as follows, which was adopted:

WHEREAS, Through the dispensation of Divine Providence a sudden and sad calamity has overwhelmed our hearts in the death of our dear classmate, Abraham L. Hunsicker, lately moving among us in health and the bloom of youth, with the promise of a bright future, and endowed with talents that would have qualified him, had he lived, for a position of great usefulness: AND, WHEREAS, our feelings prompt us to the expression of deepest sorrow at the demise of one so intimate and well-beloved; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we lay to our hearts the impressive lesson thus taught us of the brevity of life, and the dangers that stand thick upon our pathway, in lurking arrows that may come from a quarter least expected.

*Resolved*, That our friendly sympathy and condolence are hereby tendered to the family and friends of the deceased, who mourn under the heavy mantle of grief which this sad event has laid upon them, and commend them to the strong arm of Him who can prop the bruised reed and bind up the broken heart.

*Resolved*, That we attend his funeral as a class, and that we wear the usual badge of mourning for thirty days.

*Resolved*, That a copy of these proceedings be presented to the parents of our deceased classmate, and furnished to the *Reformed Church Monthly*, *Christian World*, and *Montgomery Ledger*, for publication.

S. M. HENCH,  
J. W. MABRY,  
P. L. SHELLEY,

*Committee.*

I remain your obedient servant,


C. C. KEELER,

Sec. of Class.

A paper of like purport with the above was adopted at a general meeting of the students of the College.

THE *Spring term* of the institution will open on Monday, April 6.

## EDITORS' DESK.

 All receipts of money for the *Monthly*, or other purposes connected with the College, will be immediately acknowledged by postal card, or by letter. Any one, therefore, remitting money to us, who does not get such an acknowledgment within a few days, may conclude that the remittance has miscarried. This applies, also, to amounts forwarded during the past month.

An unusual press of leading articles pushes the Desk for this month into a very narrow corner. We regret this the more, as interesting symptoms have developed in a certain quarter during the last four weeks, which invite some special consideration. Under the circumstances, they can be little more than merely noted.

No. 1 must probably be set down as one of those ludicrous mistakes sometimes made by printers, especially when they are *setting up* from bad copy. It makes one of the theological professors at Lancaster speak of the opposition to their grievous errors as "*breaking down*." Of course, the writer of the article could not say that truly, and surely he would not deliberately write what was not true. He could not, for instance, have so soon forgotten how he or his colleague had "*broken down*," or backed down, which is the same thing, in our little discussion about the *pantheistic character* of his theology. And, again, it is hardly possible that he has forgotten how awkwardly he floundered in the futile attempt to prove that falling back into ultra old Lutheranism was *not* a development of Reformed theology to an advanced, higher position. Or, *once more*, he must have a very treacherous memory, if he has forgotten the sad plight into which he was thrown by the exposure of the absurd effort to show that when the Heidelberg Catechism declares that the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the cross is the only ground and foundation of our salvation, *it did not mean what the words plainly taught*. And, finally, though he may have forgotten his bitter feelings against those refractory *foreign Germans* at Cincinnati, who chose to obey God and their conscience, rather than yield to the overbearing dictates of a Lancaster sanhedrim, he could not forget that his party was then and there so rarely put out by adverse issues on several vital questions, that some of them strongly hinted at a rupture with the General Synod. Surely, the printer must have mistaken our friend's copy, and should make due amends. Either that, or our friend has had one of those dreams which go by contraries; or, he is like the man of whom our beloved *Rauch* used to tell the class in psychology, who, imagining that his head was turned around, persisted in walking backwards, and got angry when told he was going the wrong way.

No. 2 is possibly a somewhat similar typographical blunder. The writer is made to say something about *guerilla* warfare. If his copy really had that word, he was probably thinking of his party's *gorilla* style of assailing those who dared to come in their way, and somehow got the thing mixed up in his



mind with the matter then troubling him. Such psychological confusions are not unusual at Lancaster.

No. 3. These same friends, with amazing coolness, imagine they can make people believe that they are *not going backwards but forwards*, merely by saying so. Vain delusions! They imagine they are writing for Papists accustomed to believe whatever the priests say, not for Protestants who "prove all things and hold fast to that which is true." Let Lancaster understand that it can't any longer run the Reformed church back into old Lutheranism or Rome and make us believe that it is *moving forwards*—especially not after proving so clearly by Dr. Krauth's article, that Dr. Gerhart's tract No. 3 teaches anti-Reformed doctrine.

No. 4. *An extraordinary claim* has been recently reiterated by the same party. It is nothing less than that *Mercersburg theology* is entitled to the credit of having revived *respect for the Heidelberg Catechism* in the German Reformed church, and of being the special protector of its principles!!! What have the fathers in our Israel to say to this? Somehow, the moment we read it, memory recalled a speech of Rollo to the Peruvians, with something in it about "such protection as vultures give to lambs." May be one of the "Theological Faculty" can explain how that line was called up in the connection.

No. 5. *Dr. Schneck's* point blank matter of fact book against the new-order errors, has received most favorable notices in all directions. But the most remarkable one yet remains to be written. It should appear in a paper published in Philadelphia, called the "*Reformed Church Messenger*." The *Evangelist* (German) of Cleveland, seems to think it strange that the *Messenger* has thus far not even named the book, and interprets the silence as a sort of studied contempt. Perhaps the *Evangelist* is not aware of the former intimate relation of the Editor of the *Messenger* with Dr. Schneck, and of how he came to get into those relations. It may be that the Editor of the *Messenger* feels that a book from such a source merits so kind and flattering a notice, that due time and care should be given to its preparation.

Moreover, he may be aware that the book is meanwhile not suffering at all from the *Messenger's* silence, and the demand for it, and rapidity of its circulation, is unprecedented in the Reformed church. Even in our small way we have had occasion to order *eighteen dozen copies*.

The *German* edition is now ready for distribution. It is published by J. Kohler, 206 North 4th-st., Philadelphia, who is ready to fill orders for it. We are prepared to fill any orders for either the English or German edition.

*The old artifice* of charging Dr. Schneck with misquotations, and false quotations, is again being tried. One specimen of this which has come under our eye, really amounts to no more than an omission of the cross stroke in a *t* or the dot over an *i*. It is enough, however, to afford an opportunity for accusing of misquotation, and making a sweeping charge to that effect. No, the great crime of the book is, that it quotes too accurately for the party who wish to keep the Church ignorant of their real views and schemes.

By the way, we have just been told that it is reported, first that the prefatory

letter of the book is a *fabrication*, and that Dr. Schneck has declared that he is sorry he ever wrote the book. We venture, without consulting the author, to pronounce both these statements unqualified falsehoods. But they are quite in keeping with some other falsehoods manufactured and circulated in aid of the bad cause of Romish high-churchism now disturbing our peace.

When false doctrines, subversive of Gospel truth have found it impossible to succeed by making full, open, and frank avowals of what they are, they will try to clothe themselves in the garments of truth. They will use even the very terms in which the truth is expressed, and hide their real character under the drapery of evangelical words. Of this fact the history of the Judaizing teachers in Galatia, of the Nicolaitanes in Pergamos, (Rev. 2: 15), of the Eutychians, Arians, Pelagians, and many other gross perverters of Christianity, furnish numerous illustrations. In modern times Jesuits, Romish and others, have made themselves notorious by this shameful artifice, by which many have been, and are, deceived.

How important, in view of this fact, to heed the admonition of our Lord in Matt. 24: 11, 24, 25, and of His beloved disciple John (1 John 4: 1). "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits," &c.; and of the earnest apostle Jude, "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." "Be not deceived."

The rights of the people, that is of lay-members of the church, and of Consistories, should be well studied and calmly insisted upon in these days. Especially should Consistories be careful to select such delegates to Classes as will fairly and truly represent the views and convictions of the congregations. It has no doubt often happened that by neglecting to do so, a congregation in which the great majority of the members were decidedly opposed to the high-church ritualistic movement, has been represented at Classis by a Pastor of different sentiments, and an Elder, who would vote as his Pastor voted. Evidently this is wrong, and leads to deceptive results.

*Acknowledgments.*—Rev. J. S. Weiss, York co., \$25; Rev. J. A. Peters, Alexandria, cash, \$53; Rev. J. A. Peters, box of sundries valued at \$25. For these additional contributions in aid of our Ministerial educational fund the liberal donors have the sincere thanks of the College.

*For Missions in Philadelphia Classis:* First Reformed church, Race-st., Philadelphia, Rev. Dr. E. H. Nevin, Pastor, \$75.

## BOOK NOTICES.

FROM *Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger*, 626 Market street, Philadelphia.

"*Easy Lessons in Natural Science*," with illustrations. Designed for schools and families. By R. E. Kremer, author of "Bible Gems."



The most impressive proofs and illustrations of the being of God, furnished by the world of nature, may be found in the adaptations of nature to man, as a *rational* and a *moral* being. There is more by far in the water of the brook, and in the flower of the field, to excite, develop, and gratify the powers of man's mind, and the emotions of his heart, than to quench the thirst of the panting hart, or still the hunger of the grazing ox. Air and light are not better suited to the wants and comfort of our physical nature, than they are to our spiritual nature. This adaptation runs through every department of creation, and at every step will be found adding to the weight of the great argument thus supplied.

Such being the case, the corresponding advantage of training the mind from youth up to a careful contemplation of the numerous and diversified natural objects surrounding it, must be admitted. That material nature may serve its noblest end in developing unmaterial mind, in being the Creator's vast *object-lesson* school for the education of man as a living soul, the attention of the mind must be given or directed to what nature thus displays.

Hence, the value of such books as this, compiled by Miss R. E. Kremer. By the simple method of easy questions, and plain, brief answers, the pupil is pleasantly led over the whole course of the natural sciences, and made sufficiently acquainted, for a beginner, with everything in nature, "from the cedar of Lebanon to the hyssop that springeth out of the wall;" from the great Sirius that glows among the stars in the far distant heavens, to the fire-fly sparkling in the meadows of a summer night. The book merits commendation and success, and will doubtless win both. It is admirably suited to our public schools at this time, and all families with young children would derive great benefit from its use.

From the *Leighton Publication Board*, 1225 Sansom street, Philadelphia.

"*Wahrheit des Christenthums.*" This is a German translation of the late *Bishop McIlwaine's* well-known excellent work on the *Evidences of Christianity*. That work, in English, has had a very wide circulation, and is greatly esteemed. Being very full, popular in its method and style, and most decidedly evangelical, it is the very book needed for general circulation, and will furnish our German friends with one of the best summaries of evidences which could reach them. It deserves the favorable consideration of the pastors of our German congregations, and will prove an invaluable aid to them in their important work.

From the *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, 1334 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.

"*The Parsonage in the Hartz.*" Translated and adapted from the German, by Mrs. Cornelia McFadden. 16mo. Four illustrations. Price \$1.15.

A truly German tale, all alive with German thought, feeling, and action, and unfolding phases of daily life and spiritual conflict striking to the American reader. It brings out the thought, that the Christian heart lives in a supreme devotion to Christ, as the Lord and centre of the believer's soul. Love and

marriage enter into the current of the story; but they are tributary to this idea, and to that of implicit submission to the orderings of an all-wise God.

"*Heavenward Bound: Words of help for young Christians.*" By Olive A. Wadsworth.

A prize of \$250, offered for the best book, of small size, for the instruction of young converts, was awarded to the author of this volume. It seems richly to have merited the award, and will richly repay not only young Christians, but those of riper years, if they carefully read and ponder its earnest truths and counsels.

*The International Review.*—1. The chief object of this Review will be the sifting and telling treatment of great questions of our age and country above mere sect and party; literary, scientific, social, national, religious.

2. It shall bring to its pages the best talent of Europe and America, and seek to be a medium of communication for representative thinkers of the age. A large number of able contributors has already been secured.

3. While fearless and progressive, aiming to lead the times by advancing every healthful reform, it shall never assail the divine authority of the Scriptures, or the supremacy of our Constitution over a united republic.

4. Seeking always to elevate style, and to secure the very best writers of the world, it shall not address merely scholars and divines, but furnish guidance and information in pleasing and popular forms to practical men in business and the professions.

5. Issued SIX TIMES A YEAR, it will seek to occupy a place between the Monthlies and the Quarterlies, and unite sprightliness with dignity.

6. Very special attention will be given to the notices of books in all departments of art, science and literature.

7. The success of the INTERNATIONAL REVIEW will be made to depend on its comprehensive plan, solid merit, and adaptation in style and subject to the times.

8. As our Republic sprang from the whole past of the historic nations of the other continent, and as we are now so closely connected with all countries, in accordance with the origin of our people and the breadth of our age, shall this REVIEW be a representative of the Old World and the New—to the maturity of the former uniting the energy of the latter. Terms, \$5 a year.

*Reformirte Kirchenzeitung.* Since January 1, 1874, this weekly German paper has passed over into the hands of the *German Classis of Philadelphia*, and is under the editorial management of the Rev. N. Gehr. This change thus far shows itself to be a decided improvement in every respect. The paper is now again under the control of undoubtedly evangelical Reformed principles, and can be warmly recommended to the churches. It needs a more extended circulation, and, under the present esteemed editor and management, is doing everything to deserve it. East Pennsylvania should take at least two thousand copies.



## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

OUR BRANCH—*Changes in the Ministry.*—Rev. S. Shaw, from Congress, Wayne county, O., to Salem charge, Westmoreland county.

Rev. Edmund Erb to Danville, Livingston county, N. Y.

Rev. J. G. Shoemaker from Curls ville, Mercer county, Pa., to Reading, Pa.

Rev. S. K. L. Kessler from Rossville to Corydon charge, Harrison county, Ind.

Rev. C. J. A. Hullhorst to Wales, Ogle county, Ill.

Rev. Josiah May from Findlay, O., to Cochran ton, Crawford county, Pa.

Rev. Dr. Masco Kieffer from Greencastle to Gettysburg, Pa.

Rev. D. K. Falcaron from Shelbyville to Windsor, Ill.

Rev. C. Pluess to Fort Defiance, O.

Rev. H. Hartman to Tamaqua, Schuylkill county, Pa.

Rev. J. H. Keller from Republic, O., to Denver, Colorado.

Rev. Hermann Bikum to 28 Price street, Germantown, Pa.

Rev. Eli Keller from Canal, Winchester, O., to Zionsville, Lehigh county, Pa.

Rev. Voss was licensed, ordained and installed by Miami Classis, as pastor of the congregation in Covington, Ky.

Rev. A. Schneck, of Allen county, O., has accepted a call to a field in Nebraska.

Rev. W. B. Sandoe has resigned the Auburn (Ind.) charge.

GROWTH OF THE CHURCHES—Turbotville, Pa., 24 persons were added. Nazareth, Pa., Rev. M. H. Smith, 12. Mt. Carmel, Montgomery county, O., Rev. H. Hanker, 24. Louisville, Ky., 5 families were added. Johnsville, O., 11. Mt. Zion charge, D. Winters, 40. Timothy congregation, New Madison charge, 10. Canton, O., Rev. E. Hirbruck, 28. Fremont, O., T. J. Backer, 5. Emanuel church, Rev. S. Shaw, 5. Carrollton, O., M. A. Miller, 13. Xenia, O., Rev. S. B. Yockert, 19. Summit charge, Lake, O., 5. Bethel and Hill-Grove, Rev. J. Stack, 21. Heidelberg chapel, Philadelphia, Rev. Hendrickson, 11. Sunbury, Pa., Rev. C. S. Gerhard, 4. Newport, Perry county, Pa., Rev. James Crawford, 16. Mifflinburg, Pa., 16. Conyngham and Butler charge, Rev. J. M. Clemens, 93. Reigle ville, Pa., Rev. R. Leighton Gerhart, 8. Dark county, O., Rev. W. McCreghey, 10. Philadelphia, St. John's church, Rev. J. G. Nass, 3. De Kalb county, Ind., Rev. H. Bair, 3. Aura, Ill., Rev. J. A. Smith, 8. Lancaster, O., Rev. W. A. Hale, 32. Philadelphia, Christ Reformed church, Rev. J. H. Dubbs, 2. Alexandria, Pa., Rev. J. A. Peters, 17. Garran town, O., Rev. C. A. Good, 8. Mohicanville, O., Rev. O. E. Lakes, 1. Cleveland, O., second church, Rev. Young, 12; fourth church, Rev. Troutman, 3 heads of families.

NEW CHURCHES, &c.—Rev. J. B. De Beer recently started the organization of a congregation in Parkersburg, Iowa, with about forty families. They are building a parsonage at a cost of \$3,000.

In Berks county, Pa., the Reformed church numbers 22 pastors, 56 congregations, and 11,000 communicants.

In Somerset, Pa., a new church was dedicated on February 1, free of debt. Pastor, Rev. Keener.

The splendid new church in Reading, Rev. Dr. Bausman, pastor, has been duly dedicated. It is said to be the finest church edifice in the interior of the State.

A new congregation (German) was recently organized in Pittsburg, under Pastor Müllder's (D. P.) care.

ITEMS OF CHURCH NEWS DESIRED.—Brethren will confer a great favor by furnishing us promptly with any items of interest within their respective charges. Please write them on separate strips of paper.

NEW YORK CITY AND VICINITY.—There is a manifest religious awakening in the churches of New York city. The Union meetings and services of the Presbyterian and Reformed churches, heretofore adverted to in these columns, have been productive of excellent results. At a meeting of inquiry held on an evening last week, thirty-five persons presented themselves as repentant and desirous of leading the Christian life. All the meetings have been well attended, and the interest has been very marked.

There is also a profound religious interest among persons who attend the various chapels of the City Mission. In the Lebanon Chapel, Columbia-street, twenty-five persons asked for prayers a day or two ago; and thirty persons asked for prayers in the De Witt Chapel on Greenwich street. At the Bowery Y. M. C. A. rooms, the meetings are thronged, and the religious feeling is apparently strong. At the Seaman's Mission, the Calvary Chapel, and the Helping Hand, similar interest is manifested. It is the universal opinion of city clergymen that there has been no such religious awakening for years.

THE Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria has authorized his government to assume a strong attitude against the Ultramontane opposition to the ecclesiastical laws.

The Pope has written to the Austrian Bishops inviting them to use all their influence to prevent the passage of the proposed ecclesiastical laws.

The Roman Catholic Bishops in the Reichsrath threaten to withdraw if the passage of the ecclesiastical bill is pressed.

BISHOP Reinkens has made a masterly reply to the Pope's last encyclical. He says, as a demonstration of the absurdity of the pretence of infallibility: "The Pope who was most feared, and who was surrounded with the greatest splendor on earth, Innocent III., condemned the English Magna Charta, cursed it, appealed to the heavenly and terrestrial powers against it, and struck it with his anathema and interdict. Nevertheless, the Magna Charta did not fall; it made the people of England great; and who will say that the English nation has lost its Christianity?"

A FRENCH correspondent states that the Bishop of Nîmes has received, as a



reply to his recent pastoral, two visiting cards, one from Mdme. Hyacinthe de Loyson, and the other form "Hyacinthe Loyson, cure of Geneva," on which are written the following lines: "With our Christian pardon for the gross insults which you have heaped upon us."

UNDER the head of "the Week of United Prayer," the London *Record* recently contained the following advertisement, signed "Anglicanus:" "Would it not be advisable also in this to plead for the downfall of Rome and Mahomet, the lifting up of Jerusalem and Judah, and the removal of the veil that hides the Ten Tribes? These events in concurrence will be like 'Life from the dead to the world.'"

THE missions of the American Baptist Union in Europe and Africa, with the single exception of Spain, are carried on wholly by natives of the respective countries.

DEAN STANLEY does not believe in apostolic succession. In a sermon recently preached by him in Edinburgh, he showed that, as a matter of history, there are no successors to the Apostles. These died, and appointed no one in their stead.

THE Fijians take to Christianity with amazing docility, and to-day the converts number 109,000, while there are 50,000 native children learning to read and write in the missionary schools.

OF the thirty Catholic bishops in Spain, five have joined the Carlists. A large proportion of the "passivits" are waiting their opportunity, which recent events indicate to be pretty near at hand.

DR. SEARS, agent of the Peabody School Fund, says that an intelligent citizen of Raleigh, N. C., lately told him that they had not a public school in that city, but they had just paid out \$20,000 on account of a few criminals—which fact sustains in a measure the assertion, that it costs more to sustain the people in ignorance, than it does to maintain a system of public schools.

THE evangelical ministers of Indianapolis have organized an Evangelical Union, on the doctrinal basis used by the Evangelical Alliance in its session in New York; and the same might be done, with great good resulting, in all cities and villages.

THERE were 28,000 converts added to the church in Madagascar in 1872. The Madagascar Government is so well pleased with the result of the education of the nobility by missionary agents, that it now proposes to erect a large college, where the sons of the nobility may be educated.

EPISCOPAL.—Rev. J. A. Latane, in withdrawing from St. Matthew's church, Wheeling, West Virginia, gives the following reasons for so doing:

1. The unhappy division of the church into what are known as the High and Low-church parties. 2. The countenance apparently given by certain expres-

sions in the Prayer-book to those "erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word," out of which the division in the church has grown. 3. The absolute impossibility of getting rid of these objectionable expressions in the services of the Prayer-book. 4. The attitude in which the Episcopal church stands in the present day to other Protestant churches.

THE American Bible Society has just published the book of Exodus, in a separate 18mo. volume, for the use of Sunday-schools, in connection with the international series of lessons. It is bound in muslin, with flexible covers, and sold for six cents. The Gospel of Mark can also be obtained separately for eight cents.

IN a Roman telegram to the *Daily News* we read: "A confidential circular of Prince Bismarck to the diplomatic agents of Germany abroad, says that the German Government has done everything in its power to avoid a conflict with the church, but that the conduct of the Vatican now compels it to carry on the struggle to the end. The whole German nation, in the interest of the Empire, urges the government to act with energy against the absurd pretensions of Rome to interfere with the civil rights of the State.

A LATE number of the Madras *Athenaeum* says: "The Juggernaut festival in Hooghly closed on the Saturday before last with more murderous results than ever. At Goopto, in the interior, twenty people fell while the car was being dragged, eight were run over, five were killed on the spot, and three were wounded, of whom one has since died. The six victims were women."

THE education of native girls in India is progressing satisfactorily, in spite of the social prejudices against it. In a recent examination of the Free Church Orphanage, six girls out of ten obtained sufficient marks to have put them in the first division of the university list; and some of the examiners were Hindoos. Similar results have been obtained in Madras, where the girls pass the government examination for certificated schoolmistresses.

MEDICAL work grows more in importance as an evangelistic agency. In the Calcutta hospitals, in 1872, a quarter of a million of people found assistance, of whom *one-third were women and children!*

LUNALILO, the King of the Sandwich Islands, died at his palace, in the island of Hawaii, February 3d, after a brief illness. He was born in 1835, and elected king January 1st, 1873. He died unmarried.

It is announced that Mr. Frederick Charrington, of London, England, having retired from a firm of brewers on the ground of the evil caused by drink, has become a missionary to the poor of East London. He has, it is stated, bought a chapel in Bethnal Green, in which to carry on his labors.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—MAY, 1874.—No. 5.

---

CHRIST OUR LIFE.

(*Second Article.*)

A FURTHER consideration of this precious doctrine will no doubt be agreeable to our readers.\* It is well entitled to such additional thought, and there are some special reasons for giving it our most careful study at this time. The foundation of the true, and hitherto generally accepted doctrine on the subject, has been disturbed. Views regarding it are set forth and advocated by ministers filling prominent places in our church, which are not only new to us, and at variance with the faith of evangelical Christianity, but which are calculated to unsettle the minds of some believers, and to confuse and mislead others. There is need, therefore, of turning from the vain speculations of philosophy (falsely so called), to the simple and solid teachings of the Word of God. Thus may we be more securely fortified against the influences of deceptive error, and become more firmly and comfortably rooted and grounded in the faith.

In doing this, the passages of Scripture cited in the former article, may serve as a sufficient help and guide. Let the reader turn to them, and keep them under his eye.

---

\*A strange typographical error occurred at the end of the first paragraph of the April article. There should be a *period* after the word "*misapprehension*," and the words: "*and have ever held it*," should come in after the word "*truth*" in the first line of the next paragraph. For the correction of some other errors see *Editors' Desk*.

The doctrine of the Reformed church, and, indeed, of all evangelical churches, based on such passages, and learned from them, includes the following points :

*The Death from which Man needs Deliverance.*

*First*, fallen, apostate man, is "dead in sin." This term, *dead*, as used in the Scriptures, and employed accordingly in evangelical theology, is, of course, a figurative term, taken from natural or physical things, and applied to spiritual things. But it expresses a most real and solemn fact. Through sin man fell under the penalty and power of what may be fitly called spiritual death. As a corpse is a body whose different organs and functions are dead as to those uses which they served when the body was alive, the eye dead to light, the ear to sound, and the hand to touch, so the soul or spirit sunk in sin, is dead as to all *right* and *proper* use of the various faculties and affections of our nature. It is dead to God, for living and devout and blissful fellowship with whom it was originally created and designed ; dead to all right knowledge of God ; dead as to all moral ability to love Him as He would and should be loved ; dead to all proper apprehensions of His infinite glory and excellence ; dead as to all moral power to obey and serve Him ; dead as to all duties enjoined in regard to our relations to our fellow men. And, as all physical death involves corruption, so this spiritual and moral, or ethical death, involves the total corruptness and depravity of human nature.

The seat of this death is in the central constitution of man's soul or spirit. It reigns not only over his thoughts, but over his thinking ; it has dominion not only over his affections, but over his very heart, or the inmost spring of those affections. Hence, the deepest, ultimate seat of sin, is not in the flesh, materially considered, not in the substance of which he is made, but in his soul or spirit. His body, or bodily substance, is, of course, brought under the tyranny of sin, and his bodily organs are polluted by it, and become involved in its dreadful consequences. But the real seat of sin or evil is not in matter, and does not necessarily belong to the essence of matter. It spreads out from the sinful soul to the body, to the fleshly appetites of which, thus perverted and degraded, the sinful soul then yields itself a slave.

In all this, now, (and what has been said is enough for our present purpose, without going into further details), man has



*voluntarily* involved himself. Hence, it is not merely his great misery to be sinful, but his grievous fault. He is not only depraved, but *guilty*. As guilty, he falls under the dreadful penalty of sin. This is *legal death*, as the curse which God in His holy justice pronounced against sin, and passed upon it. There is a formal or forensic consequence of sin, as well as a moral, and, as it may be called, a natural one. This is set forth in the condemnation and sentence of the sinner to temporal and eternal death.

It is true that some in our day, as well as formerly, object to any such view of the case. They would be wise *against* "what is written." Such terms and language are too "mechanical and superficial" for their profound philosophy. As, therefore, they disdain the Gospel doctrine of the atonement, so they spurn this way of speaking of the formal death-penalty against sin. But no matter for their contempt. Let them quarrel, not with us for clinging to such language and the doctrine it sets forth, but with Him who has taught us to use it, and with His faithful servants who, under inspiration, constantly employ it. For our part, we frankly confess a strong preference for St. Paul's way of presenting the matter, though it may not quite suit the theory of our Lancaster friends.

Man, therefore, as a sinner, lies under the power and wretchedness of spiritual death in this two-fold sense. And it is from this two-fold death that he needs deliverance and redemption.

All that belongs to him as a human soul and body, all that is *essential* to his humanity, in this view, is still present in him, still exists. He is still a real human being, and needs nothing added to his substance, no new substance, no new faculties, no additional powers of affection. But he is spiritually dead, and under a formal penalty or curse of eternal death by the righteous sentence of God's justice.

*The Life to which Man needs Restoration.*

The *second* point in our doctrine concerns the life to which man needs to be restored. As might be expected, the Scriptures represent this life as corresponding to the death under which he has fallen through sin.

By redemption man is not to be made a "new creature," in the sense of being made another sort of creature or being. He is still to remain a true, real man, and so far, a mere human being, as he

was before. No new or essentially different elemental substance is to be put into him, or added to his proper substance, as some have vainly dreamed, and as boldly as falsely taught. Redeemed sinners are as really mere men, or mere human beings, as unredeemed sinners. In redemption their true personal identity remains. Saul of Tarsus and Paul the Apostle were, in this respect, the same person. Redemption does not produce, or create, a (generically) different race of beings from mankind. Even those seen around the throne in heaven, as in Revelation, are still all proper human beings, ransomed and raised up to the Jerusalem above. Redemption, according to the Gospel, allows of nothing pantheistic.

What fallen man needs, as the Scriptures teach us, is *deliverance from the evils brought on him by sin*, and a *full restoration to that which was lost through sin*, or *such a re-quickening of his inner spiritual life as shall enable him to attain the highest end of his existence in time and eternity*.

This, now, is declared to include these three things, and in the order in which they are stated :

1. Deliverance from the death-penalty, the curse pronounced against sin, under the righteous demands of the violated justice of God. The guilty sinner, to escape the deadly consequences of his guilt, must, in some sufficient way, fully satisfy the death-sentence of the law ; he must have complete justification before God provided for him, so that he may be pardoned, and pardoned on grounds honorable to God's holy law, and consistent with its purity and integrity.

2. He must be restored to right relations to God. On the part of God there must be propitiation, or reconciliation with the sinner, that is, an atonement. On the part of the sinner there must be a hearty and entire reconciliation with God, and with God as He is, and has revealed himself in His nature and attributes. Man's enmity to God, and hostile alienation from God, must be removed. The son that, in this respect, had become dead to his Father, must be made in this respect alive again.

3. There must be a *requickening* of man's inmost spiritual and moral life. He must be *renewed, renovated*, in all his faculties and affections. His understanding or reason, will and feeling, with whatever in man as an intelligent and moral being may give those attributes their tendency or inclination, must be cleansed



and *revived* according to that life for which the Creator originally made man a living soul. The *mind* must be enlightened with heavenly truth, divine knowledge, that wisdom which maketh wise unto salvation; that is, instead of the death of mental or spiritual darkness, there must be the life of light, or life-giving light. Instead of a heart dead as a stone towards God, there must be a heart *quick* and tender as living flesh in its love for Him. Instead of a *will* dead-set against obedience to God and conformity, there must be resuscitated in man a *will* all *alive* to that of God, and zealously intent upon conformity in all things to His law. There must, therefore, be a *reviving*, not only of the rational and moral powers of man in the sense of his ceasing to do evil and learning to do well, in the actual exercise of those powers, but, as the Word plainly teaches, in the deeper sense of having those powers themselves rectified, quickened with a new energy by grace for healthy and holy action. Hence, what the case of man as fallen requires in this respect, is far more than that merely moral influences should be brought to bear on his mind and heart, powerfully to induce or persuade him to change his inner and outer manner of life. There must be a change corresponding, in a spiritual sense, to a new creation in righteousness and holiness, so as to make him really a *renewed* creature.

In this brief and necessarily partial exhibition of the matter, every intelligent Christian will recognize a simple statement of views with which he has long been familiar. They are substantially, though imperfectly presented, the doctrine ever held and preached by the entire evangelical Protestant church. To charge that church with maintaining the sufficiency of merely moral influences to produce regeneration, or that regeneration is a merely moral change, is a false accusation. In single exceptional cases this may have been done. But it is not the creed of true Protestantism, and never has been.

*This life we have in and through Jesus Christ.*

The *third* main point in the doctrine under consideration is, that *Christ Jesus is our life in every sense in which man as fallen needs life in order to his redemption.*

He is declared to be so, *primarily*, by having taken upon Himself, as our voluntary and sufficient substitute, the death-penalty, the formal as well as real curse due to our sins. In "tasting death

for every man," in offering up Himself as "our Passover," "a sacrifice and a sweet-smelling savor unto God," dying "the accursed death of the cross," He procured our deliverance from the death-penalty, and so is called, as he may be most truly called, "our life." This vicarious death of Jesus, including all it involved, is well called *the ground and foundation* of our redemption, and is therefore *the great fact* to be considered and believingly embraced in regard to the person and work of Christ.

Were it needful or proper here to vindicate what some like to speak of as *the philosophy* of this view, no doubt it might be done. Indeed, it has been done by theologians as truly learned as they were devout, and in a manner as intelligible as it was learned, and which did not leave their readers in doubt as to their meaning or as to their having understood themselves. But why should their words or arguments be brought in now? Those for whom this article is written do not need it. And as for others who seem to delight in indulging their theological philosophising by adventurous speculations on such themes, what they most need is, not to be gratified by attempts to meet them on their own ground, but to be brought back in true lowliness of mind to "the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ."

*Again*, Christ is affirmed to be our life in that through Him as our mediatorial High-priest, on the basis of His vicarious sacrifice, or sacrificial death, we are restored to right relations to God. By His peace-speaking blood, God is graciously reconciled to us, and we are fully reconciled to God. In this most *vital* sense He is our peace, through whom, as our elder brother (nowhere in the New Testament is He called our Father, not even where Paul alludes to Him as the second Adam), we become sons of God *by adoption*, and living members of the household of faith, admitted as such to all the blessed privileges of children, pertaining both to this life and to that which is to come.

*Finally*, Christ is our life, inasmuch as in and through Him, on the ground of His complete and accepted atonement, the gift of the Holy Ghost is shed upon us, unto our regeneration, the renewal, or new creation of our inmost being in all its faculties and powers, and our living union with Him in the Spirit, so that we may be most truly called, in the Gospel sense, members of His body. He rules in us, animates us, imparts His quickening and supporting grace to us, by the Spirit, so that it is no more



we "that live, but Christ living in us." And all this in a way that calls for personal faith on our part, and a personal, believing appropriation of Him and His benefits. The consummation of all is to be reached in that heavenly state when the new life thus begun on earth shall become *life everlasting*.

How plainly and positively this doctrine, resting as it does in the cited Scriptures given in the April number, excludes and condemns every pantheistic view of Christ as our life. It knows, and, according to the Gospel, can know nothing of a conveyance of the substance of the assumed philanthropic nature of Christ, as the germ or basis of our life in Him. It rejects, excludes, the false notion of regeneration in this way by baptism, or of any literal eating and drinking of some actually conveyed substance of Christ in the Lord's Supper. But it does meet and satisfy all the felt wants of the soul awakened to a sense of its death through sin, and its need of newness of life in and through the Redeemed.

---

THE LITURGICAL QUESTION.

(*Continued.*)

So much is shown, indeed, by the actual practice of the church in regard to them from the first. They were at best only of provincial and temporary authority. With the progress of time, new liturgies came in on all sides; which themselves, however, were no improvement on the old, but only a carrying out of what was defective in them rather to something worse. Then came the age of illumination, the triumph of the subjective principle in the form of pure rationalism, emasculating both the doctrine and the worship of the church of all their earlier life and vigor. Here was an end, of course, of all right liturgical feeling. Liturgies there were still, both Lutheran and Reformed. But they were liturgies supremely unliturgical, just as the theology of the times was also in the highest degree untheological. They were at best frigid formularies of the purely pulpit sort, that breathed no sense whatever of either altar or sacrament, and chilled all active response on the side of the people. In the last third of the

eighteenth century, as Daniel informs us in his article on the subject in Herzog's Encyclopedia, such wretchedly unliturgical *agenda*, "mere products of a sentimental subjectivity, without taste or tact, with no sense for either Christianity or the church, appear in very many Lutheran States;" and the same withering sirocco is allowed to have passed over the worship also of the Reformed churches, "though perhaps in less degree," both in Switzerland and Germany. To this iron age has happily succeeded the reactionary period, the age of restoration and reform, in which we now live. In the midst of other demands of the new religious era, there has come to prevail among the German churches generally, a sense of want in the department of public worship, which refuses to be satisfied with anything less than the most thorough reconstruction of the whole interest. Never before has there been such a full ventilation of the universal subject; never, since the Reformation, the same study of liturgical principles, or the like mastery of liturgical resources. The result of all is, thus far, not a disposition certainly to give up forms altogether in favor of free services, but the conviction, becoming always, if we understand the matter rightly, more and more general, that the true idea of a liturgy requires much more than such a merely outward ordering of forms, as that which has grown to be so poor and tame in the later agenda; and that what is needed, therefore, is not a mere passive return to the formularies of the sixteenth century, but such a revision of the whole subject as may involve a reproduction of the life and spirit of the primitive liturgies *in forms stamped with the impress of the Reformation*. It has come to be widely felt, that the great purposes of liturgical worship have never been effectually provided for by these external directories and handbooks. No liturgy in such form has been able to live like the service-book of the Church of England, by entering the religious life of a whole people. No wonder, then, that there should be, among thinking men now, a general despair of the liturgical interest under this view, and a general desire for something better.\*

\*Several things in this paragraph merit attention.

"*Frigid* formularies of the *merely pulpit* sort." If they caused the people to catch severer religious *colds* than the *other sort*, for instance that of the English Episcopal Church, they must have been frigid indeed. Even the new Order of Worship of the Committee's manufacture, a freshly kindled fire, has thus far not shown any power to produce true fervor of spirit in the service of the Lord. Colder congregations than those in which it has been introduced could hardly be found.



The sense of all these things wrought actively in the mind of the Committee, whose studies and labors have produced our Provisional Liturgy. They found themselves embraced and borne along, as it were, by what may be called the deeper movement of the age in regard to the great subject of Christian worship; and they would have felt it to be great unfaithfulness on their part to the task placed in their hands, if they had not endeavored at least to meet it with some corresponding breadth of view. Still, they did not think it enough to be ruled in the matter simply by their own judgment. At an early stage of their work, they submitted to the Synod a report, which gave that body the opportunity of declaring its mind, more particularly than had been done in the beginning, concerning the plan and principles on which it was wished to have the new Liturgy constructed. This led, it will be remembered, to the famous Baltimore instructions of 1862; which seem to be so plain, that one who runs might read their sense. Here we have, in the first place, a general order of services, to be followed in the work; and then, in the next place, certain main rules or principles are laid down by which the Committee were required to govern themselves in its preparation. Let us now hear how some of these read.\*

The first rule of all, and that which is made plainly to underlie and condition all the rest, utters itself with no uncertain sound, as follows: "The liturgical worship of the Primitive church, as far as it can be ascertained from the Holy Scriptures, the oldest ecclesiastical writers, and the Liturgies of the Greek and Latin

---

"A full ventilation, &c." Who has done most of the cleaning? The phrase in its connection recalled one of the quaint pictures in Quarle's Emblems, in which a fat little fellow, squatted on the ground, was blowing vigorously through a pipe trying to inflate the world.

"Forms stamped with the impress of the Reformation." This should rather read: forms stamping out as with horses' hoofs every trace of Reformation principles and spiritual life.

"It has come to be widely felt, &c." How widely? They have a way of measuring things at Lancaster, which is hardly civil or apostolical. ("They that measure themselves by themselves are not wise.") But really it is amusing to notice how often these Brethren mistake themselves for "all the world and the rest of mankind." Beyond the very narrow fencing of their own little bog, and a few malcontents in some other Churches, there is nothing at all of the dissatisfaction with our old way of worship, asserted to prevail. It is a pity they would not learn that their pent-up Utica is not the universe, or that because their heads are turned every body is insane.

---

\*A full answer to what is here said about the Baltimore Report will be found in the "Minority Report," which will appear in the Monthly after this one has been finished. We will only say now that the Committee did not pay proper regard, or faithfully adhere to the Baltimore instructions. Those instructions were ignored in most important particulars. It was, apparently, used only as another catch.

churches of the third and fourth centuries ought to be made as much as possible the *general basis* of the proposed Liturgy; the more so, as they are in fact also the source from which the best portions of the Liturgies of the sixteenth century were derived—such as the forms of confession and absolution, the litanies, the creeds, the *Te Deum*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the collects, the doxologies, &c.”

Then it follows in the next rule: “Among the latest Liturgies special reference ought to be had to the old *Palatinate* and other *Reformed Liturgies* of the sixteenth century.”

It is added, however, in the third rule: “Neither the ancient Catholic nor the old Reformed Liturgies ought to be copied slavishly, but reproduced rather in a free, evangelical spirit, and adapted to the peculiar wants of our own age and denomination; inasmuch as these Liturgies themselves exhibit to us a considerable variety with essential unity, and as every age of the church has the promise of the Spirit, and a peculiar mission to fulfill. For the same reason, new forms may be prepared also, but in keeping with the devotional spirit of the church in her purest days.”

How, in the face of all this, any one should be so bold as to say that the business of the Liturgical Committee was only to put forth a new edition of the old *Palatinate* Liturgy, or at most a compilation of forms, not going beyond the range and manner of the Reformed Liturgies [generally of the sixteenth century—unless it might be in the way merely of such watery dilutions of their doctrinal life and spirit as had come to prevail in the eighteenth century, when the church had its first transplantation to this country—may well, indeed, appear surpassingly strange. Beyond all controversy, these instructions mean, if they have any meaning at all, that the Committee was *not* expected to go to work in any such narrow way. They were *not* to feel themselves slavishly bound by the practice of the fathers of the Reformed church in Switzerland and Germany, and much less, of course, by the practice of the younger fathers in this country. They were to have reference, it is said, to the Liturgies of the sixteenth century; but they were not to stop short with these, by any means, in their work. They must fall back on the sources from which the best portions of these modern formularies were derived; and they must do this in such a manner as to make the ancient wor-



ship "as much as possible the *general basis* of the proposed Liturgy." This ancient worship, it is said, moreover, is to be ascertained not simply from the Bible, but from "the oldest ecclesiastical writers and the Liturgies of the Greek and Latin churches of the third and fourth centuries." This amounts to the same here, as if in the department of doctrine it had been ordered to produce a new system of theology, having due regard to the Reformed Confessions of the sixteenth century, but looking through these to the early Christian Creeds, as being, after all, the general basis of all right confessional faith, to the end of time. No one would think of taking that to mean that the old creeds should hold a merely subordinate and secondary relation to the modern confessions; it would mean just the reverse—that the old creeds are to be considered, as far as they reach, of principal and normative authority for these modern formularies. And now, when we hear the church ordering a new Liturgy which, with due regard to the worship of the sixteenth century, shall yet so reach back through this to the beginnings and foundations of all Christian worship in the early church, as to find there its *general basis*, and to be thus a revision and reconstruction of the old Reformed system from this ground upwards—is it not plain that the words must be taken in substantially the same sense? In neither view, however, must the new work be a mere outward putting together of old forms. It must be the reproduction of the past, under a character of evangelical freedom, "adapted to the peculiar wants of our age and denomination." But this only goes to show, again, how little thought there was of narrowing the sphere of its preparation to the liturgical productions of the sixteenth century.

The new Liturgy, it appears at once from the spirit and tenor of these instructions, was to be more than a mere pulpit service book, a directory for the minister simply, in the use of which the people were to have no part. "A Liturgy," we are told, "will never fully answer its purpose, and be sufficiently appreciated by the congregations if it is confined to the hands of the minister. Like the Bible, the Catechism and the Hymn Book, it ought to be the common property and manual of every member of the church. The laymen will take a far deeper interest in the devotional exercises, if they can follow the minister by their book, and respond at least with an audible *Amen* at the end of each prayer." The plan proposed for the work requires, at the same

time, that regard be had to the course of the church year, and to the old Christian festival seasons, "especially Christmas, Easter, Pentecost and Trinity Sunday." Of the same general significance is the assumption, that the proposed Liturgy must include not only forms of confession and absolutions, but litanies also, the creeds, the Te Deum, the Gloria in Excelsis, collects, doxologies, and other such liturgical material borrowed from the worship of ancient times. These are things which look beyond the notion of a mere pulpit manual. They belong properly only to that second conception of a liturgy, by which it is made to be a joint service for minister and people, revolving throughout around the idea of the altar.

"If these principles," say the Synod, "be wisely and conscientiously carried out, it is hoped that, by the blessing of God, a Liturgy might be produced at last which will be a bond of union both with the ancient Catholic church and the Reformation, and yet be the product of the religious life of our denomination in its present state."

The general sense of the whole, we say again, is abundantly clear. What the Synod wanted and ordered in 1852, was a Liturgy which should not follow mechanically any past formulary of the Reformed church, whether in Europe or in this country, but should be a free reproduction rather of the Reformed cultus, on the general basis and ground of the original Christian worship, and in the spirit of our own denominational position at the present time. Under this character, accordingly, the Provisional Liturgy, in 1857 made its appearance, and submitted itself, under synodical sanction, to the trial of the church. It has never pretended to appear in any other character. *It has not professed at all to be of one order simply with the liturgical practice of the German Reformed Church in the sixteenth century; and much less of one order with what had come to be its liturgical practice in the eighteenth century, when it was first transplanted into this country.* That practice from the beginning is believed to have been too naked and bald; running naturally into the theory which makes a liturgy to be a book of outward forms and nothing more. *The New Liturgy was constructed throughout on another theory altogether—the theory of an altar service,* as we have endeavored to explain it before, in distinction from what may be called a service simply of the pulpit. It has aimed to be liturgical in the



full sense of the term. There is no room for any mistake with regard to either its purpose or its profession, in this respect. It makes common cause with the Liturgies of the ancient church, by laying its hand from the start on such "primitive forms" as not only the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Apostles' Creed*, and the *Ten Commandments*, but also the *Nicene* and *Athanasian Creeds*, the *Magnificat*, the *Benedictus*, the *Nunc Dimitis*, the *Trisagion*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Ambrosian Hymn*; appropriating them as elementary matter for its own use, and so announcing at once the sphere in which it seeks to move. Here, too, we have a full *Litany*, on the basis of the "ancient Latin Litanies," responses and all. Next in order we have the *Church Year*, with *Scripture Lessons* and *Collects*, also of old authority, running from the First Sunday in *Advent* to the Twenty-seventh Sunday after *Trinity*, and having due regard throughout to the leading church *Festivals*. Then, again, we have special canticles and prayers for these special times and seasons, all designed to keep the sense of them fresh and green in the mind of the church. These, altogether, are such peculiarities and characteristics as go of themselves to show to what order of worship the new Liturgy belongs, and from the first intended to belong. In its offices of the *Holy Sacraments* this comes into full view. *The Liturgy rests on the sacramental principle throughout. It breathes throughout a sacrificial spirit.* It is a service everywhere for the people, in active concert with the minister. Its whole character in this view, we say again, is openly manifest and clear; so that there has never been any reason for making it the subject of a moment's question or doubt.

Such as it is, however, the Provisional Liturgy has not come thus far, as we know, into any general use in the church. We cannot say, indeed, that there has been any general trial of its merits; for this could be only by some full congregational transaction of its offices themselves, in their own form; whereas, for the most part, they have been scanned only in an outside way, or at best experimented upon in broken parcels, sundered from their proper adjuncts, and tinkered at pleasure into other connections and other shapes. No such abstract judgment upon the forms of such a liturgy, exercised from the stand-point of common pulpit prayer, with or without forms, can ever deserve much consideration. A true liturgy, in this respect, is like a piece of music; it must be judged from within; it must be actually sung or

performed, in order that it may be rightly understood. But let this pass. *We will not stop now to inquire why the new Liturgy has failed to get into any wide use. Enough to know that such is the fact;* and that on the strength of it now, it has been considered necessary to have the work revised and altered, in order to make it what the church is still supposed to want and to wish. With this view it was placed in the hands of the old Liturgical Committee again, by the Synod which met last fall at Easton.

It seemed to be the mind of the Synod that this revision was not to be radical at all, but conservative rather of the general form and spirit of the book as it now stands. That apparently was the thought of the different Classes also in their previous separate action on the subject; for while they suggest different points of improvement, in a sufficiently loose and promiscuous way, they profess in general full satisfaction with the reigning plan of the Liturgy; all ready to join at least, it would seem, with the Classis of Philadelphia, in saying: "We approve of the Liturgy which the Synod has submitted to the examination and provisional use of the church, regarded as a whole, and believe that with such modifications and changes as it was allowed from the first issue of the book might be found necessary and expedient, it may be readily adapted to the views and wants of our church at large." The resolution of reference, on the part of the Synod, passed unanimously after long and full discussion, is yet more decidedly conservative in its tone. It reads as follows:

*"Resolved, That the Provisional Liturgy be placed in the hands of the original Committee for final revision; and that the Committee be instructed to consider the suggestions of the Classes, as given in the minutes of their late meetings, and use them in the revision of the work, as far as the general unity of the work will allow, and in a way that shall not be inconsistent either with established liturgical principles and usages, or with the devotional and doctrinal genius of the German Reformed church."\**

\*Yes—but by the Confession of the Committee, even the Provisional Liturgy of 1857 does not harmonize, as they view it, with the faith and practice of the church. The new Order of Worship virtually discards the principles of the church altogether. The simple fact is, that the Committee had become so intent on carrying out their own notions of what a liturgy ought to be, that they lost sight of the life, faith and practice of the Reformed Church. The great thing was to get a liturgy or order of worship to suit their new theology and their grand ritualistic schemes. They may be said to have been ruled by another thought and aim than that of serving or obeying the church.



Here was no thought certainly of any organic change in the work, but just the reverse. The general unity of the work, as it now stands, must be maintained. Any alterations made must be circumstantial only, and not fundamental. The essential theory and scheme of the Liturgy must remain as they are—an order of worship based on the Christian cultus of the first ages, *but representing at the same time the doctrinal and devotional genius of the modern German Reformed church*, in a freely reproduced way. The resolution amounts plainly to a reëffirmation, in brief terms, of the general sense of the Baltimore instructions of 1852, as we have them already under consideration. These were not abrogated by the Synod of Easton. They continue in force still for the Liturgical Committee, as much as ever.

(*To be continued.*)

---

#### JESUS THE TRUE AND ONLY PRIEST.

BY REV. H. H. W. HIBSHMAN.

I CANNOT think of anything, and no one can tell us of anything so cheering, encouraging and comforting, as that which Paul states in his epistle to the Hebrews, (9th and 10th chapters), "Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood, He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. \* \* \* But this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." Christ Jesus undertook to make atonement for the sins of the whole world, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life. It is a full, complete and perfect atonement. No event ever took place in the history of the world of such infinite significance as the death of Jesus Christ. And ever since men are called Christians have they celebrated the event with special memorial services.

As Christ differs from every other man in the constitution of

His person, so His death differs from the death of every other man, though it is by crucifixion, because of its momentous, its far-reaching influence and eternal significance. His death was endured to atone for sin—the crucifixion of Jesus was *the* sacrifice for sin—the offering by which He perfected forever them that are sanctified.

The perfection of the atonement for sin by Christ is of vital interest, because our hope to inherit eternal life must ground itself on this. It is the ground and foundation upon which the remission of sin, righteousness and eternal life, are granted to us freely by God, merely of grace.

The cross is the only way to peace and rest. No soul is cured of guilt and the dominion of sin but by the precious blood of Jesus. Original and actual sins, sins of omission and commission, great and small sins, are removed only by the blood of Jesus. The terrible disease of the soul is sin, and no soul can be healed but by the blood of the Son of God. "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world!" How? By pouring out His blood as water is spilled on the ground for them. "Nothing is found in heaven or earth besides His blood, that is able to heal this disease." "Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin." Heb. 9: 22. "By His stripes we are healed." For this end did God's Son assume a body out of humanity. For this end did God the Father by the Holy Ghost provide a body out of humanity for His only and beloved Son. Heb. 10: 5.

If cleansed from sin it is by the blood of the immaculate Jesus, the Son of the Virgin Mary. If purified and forever perfected, it is by the spirit of the blessed Jesus. Here we must stand, in this trust, or we will be forever lost. Those who are saved and in glory and rest, were saved by faith in the blood, the atoning death of Jesus. This is evident from what is said of them in the book of Revelation. In vision John saw them stand before the throne of God, robed in raiment washed white in the blood of the Lamb slain, and heard them praise and magnify His name for applying it to them. "*Unto Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood, to Himself be glory and dominion for ever and ever.*" Rev. 1: 5, 6.

Paul, in his epistle to the Hebrews, especially in the chapters to which we have referred, shows the weakness of the law sacrifices and the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood. He declares



the superiority of the priesthood of Jesus. Declares him the true and only Priest—the true and only sacrifice for sin. In a word, Paul shows clearly that Jesus Christ is the Antetype of all sacrifices and all priesthoods. It is evident from the words, “This Man, after He had offered *one* sacrifice, forever sat down on the right hand of God. \* \* \* For by *one* offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” Heb. 10 : 11, 12, 13, 14.

Jesus is the anointed of God the Father, as the Priest to make atonement for sin. He accomplished the work. He made the sin-offering. It is the will of God the Father that He should be acknowledged the only Priest by and in the true Christian church. His sacrifice alone satisfies the justice of God. He alone could fulfill all righteousness. “Christ came to do the will of God in two instances. In taking away the first priesthood, which God had no pleasure in, and in establishing the second, that is, His own priesthood, and the everlasting Gospel, the most pure and perfect dispensation of the covenant of grace ; this is the great design on which the heart of God was set from all eternity, and it is advantageous to the souls of men, *for it is by this will that we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all.* Observe what is the fountain of all that Christ has done for His people, the sovereign will and grace of God.”

Christ Jesus is everywhere, in the New Testament writings, regarded as the only Priest and Head of the true Christian church. As Priest He officiated on earth, the outer court ; and as Priest he is ever officiating in behalf of believers in heaven, the holy of holies—the inner court. He is an all-sufficient Priest and Saviour. He discharged, in every sense, the office of High Priest on earth. We need not show this by comparison between Him and the Levitical priesthood. Paul skilfully draws the contrast for us in his epistle above mentioned. In the eleventh verse, tenth chapter, we read, “Every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering, oftentimes, the same sacrifices.” There was no end to the priest’s work under the law. “But,” says Paul, “*this Man*, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God.”

Everyday the priest under the law had to make an offering. The fires of the altar had to be kept burning, and the blood of the slain victims kept flowing, emblematical “of the unceasing, ever-burning displeasure of Jehovah against man’s transgression, and

the utter insufficiency of all man can do to remove." But Jesus made an offering once for all, and it is all-sufficient ever and ever.

HE IS THE TRUE AND ONLY PRIEST IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,  
AND HAS NO VICARS.

Ever bear in mind, that ordained ministers in the Christian church are not "a new tribe of Levites, a class separated from the congregation and standing above it." Ministers are ministers, and not priests. They have no power to perform sacrificial acts to atone for sin. "Christ did not renounce," says Krummacker, "His threefold office of Prophet, Priest and King, but continues still to execute it within the domain of His church." Luther says, "Word, sacrament and the keys, are given to the church, *i. e.*, to the people of Christ over the wide world. We are all priests, and we have equally the same right to the Word of God, and to each of the Sacraments. We all become priests by baptism. \* \* \* By consecration to this office, the "Pfaff" does not become holier or better than all baptized Christians are. Every Christian is a Father-confessor.

#### SACRIFICE FOR SIN.

Jesus, the only Priest, offered a sacrifice for sin. It was not a heifer or a lamb, but His body. *It* was the substitute for all legal sacrifice. *It* was an offering, meeting fully all the requirements of the offended justice of God. *It* was a perfect sacrifice, and because of its perfection the necessity does no longer exist for "memorial sacrifices." There was no spot, or blemish, or imperfection, or taint of sin in it. It was entirely free from defilement and blemishes—immaculate! Only such an offering could atone for sin. And all the virtue of the sacrifices under the law lay in the respect the worshiper had for the SACRIFICE typified.

The one sacrifice made by Jesus for sin, was made by offering His own humanity taken into union with His divinity, without "mixture or confusion." "The same human nature which hath sinned, should likewise make satisfaction for sin." H. C. Ques. 16. So we learn, "I come to do Thy will, O God. He taketh away the first that He may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified *through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all.*" Heb. 10: 9, 10. It was an offering once for all.



It consisted in one act never to be repeated. It is the sole act of the mighty God himself, manifested in the flesh. The crucifiers were only instruments in His hands, by which, as the Priest, He made the true and only offering for sin. He made the offering, atoned for sin, reconciled God through His death, and perfected forever them that are sanctified.

When Jesus died on the cross, the work of salvation, as far as His priestly office had to be exercised on earth, was done. He cried out to the dismay of His crucifiers, *It is finished! It is finished.*

The shedding of His blood and His death is a perfect atonement for all sin. The Lord's Supper is a glorious memorial of it, but the administering not a repetition of it. A blessed means to enable us to understand it, be confirmed in our faith in it as all-sufficient with God to satisfy for all our sins, original and actual.

The atonement of Jesus "reaches backward to Adam, the first of mortal sinners; it reaches forward to the last of Adam's sons that shall be born on the earth and cry for mercy on it. No matter how many sinners may need it, it is enough for all; and no matter how long sinners after sinners may apply to it, it is enough still. Would you know the extent of it? It is as extensive as human guilt. 'All we have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way'—there is the evil, the wide extent of it—now comes the broad, ample remedy; the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." "*For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God.*" 1 Pet. 3: 18.

ONCE FOR ALL.

This great truth is above all others. It is fundamental to the whole beautiful structure of Protestantism. The one offering for sin by Jesus on the cross of Calvary is a complete atonement. It needs no repetition. It answers and serves for the Christian church in all ages of the world, and its virtue endures throughout all eternity. "*The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin.*" It was shed on the cross. In this is our unshaken confidence to be saved with an everlasting salvation.

---

THE life of a pious clergyman is visible rhetoric.

## ARE THE FOUNDATIONS SAFE?

WE are not of those who believe that the church of Christ should provide herself with a Procrustean bed on which to stretch all her teachers and require them to conform to prescribed words and formulas. Neither do we have an exalted opinion of the Heresy hunter who is ever on the watch to catch a rival teacher in a lapse from conventual phraseology. Least of all are we of a disposition to praise or abet that spirit of Torquemada that received such sharp illustration from our Mercersburg *friends* at the Synod of Hagerstown, in the year of our Lord 1868. When we meet the actors in that tragedy, even at this day, their presence chills our blood, and involuntarily we shudder at the remembrance of the cold-blooded and relentless tyranny that made some members of that Synod memorable as a witness of man's inhumanity to man. As we write this, we thank God that we do not live in Seville, that this is not the fifteenth century, and that President Grant has crushed the Ku-Klux in the South.

While thus tolerant of diversity of opinion, modes of thought and forms of expression; while most positively hostile to the use of the wheel, the rack, the scaffold and the faggot as a means of grace, we are, nevertheless, of opinion that the church of Christ, as the custodian of saving truth, has, for its prime duty, to *guard* the *foundations*. When error is made to *undermine* the cornerstone in which rests the faith of God's elect, it is well to look after the errorist and to make his power to harm and mislead innocuous—not after the manner of the inquisition, but to expose the error and to guard the foundations with vigilant care. It is possible that easy-going, good men, could listen quietly and with a feeling of safety as regards their refuge, to the babblings of the Mercersburg school about their philosophic theories and their scientific theology—hear their flatulent praise of antiquity—of Romish unity—and even their tirades upon pseudo Protestantism, its failures and weakness, without any fears for the foundations of the Protestant faith of their fathers. But as the term in which the *new* theology is foisted into the Reformed church assumes more definite shape, the ideas are crystallized, or the teachers of these novelties become more daring and put their innovations into comprehensible terms, there is found serious cause for alarm, as it



respects their design on the foundations of our faith—whether it be not a covert design to remove the rock itself which Christ laid. Such fears existing—an alarm being sounded—is it not competent for—is it not the duty of the Reformed church in its corporate capacity to institute an inquiry into the teachings of Mercersburg, and subject these oracular utterances given forth from that shrine to a rigid examination, and learn for her own quiet whether on applying just principles of interpretation to the teachings of this vaunted new school there, he found aught that militates against the foundations. If such be the case, so declare it. It is due the truth, is due to Christ, is due to the character of the church, and is required by the souls of men placed in peril by false doctrines. It is charged that the teaching of Mercersburg involves points affecting the doctrine of a personal, living God. The proofs of this charge are drawn from the utterances of those accredited as authority at Lancaster, and are for us so conclusive that we can detect no fallacy in the reasoning that comes to this result. The doctrine of the personality of God, as distinct from nature, and as the Creator and the Lord of the universe, and the Father of His people, is a doctrine that has always been held to be fundamental in the faith of God's church. Does not the whole Christian structure fall when the believer cannot say literally, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, *maker* of heaven and earth." It is true we have seen an attempted reply to this charge, but it was most exceedingly unsatisfactory. It was wanting in a manly and straightforward utterance of belief in terms that were intelligible. It was marked by miserable shuffling that sought refuge behind evasions, and was abandoned with simulated disgust. It was painful to see this in those whose position requires it of them, that even if in error they be frank and decided. The truth, the light, is what all would see. What shall the poor tempest-tossed pilgrims do in this life if they no longer have a true, eternal, living, personal God, to whom they can go as to a Father. It will leave them the most wretched of orphans to find that their God is diluted, and by emanation diffused throughout the universe, as its impelling, vitalizing force, but they no longer can pray to "Our Father, *who art in heaven*," *ruling and governing* the world so as to make all things work together for good to those that love Him. Is it not a most serious matter thus to remove the foundation from under God's people and make them orphans? Should not this be

looked after, and such teaching be forbidden in the Reformed church? It is charged further, that it is denied at Lancaster by this new Mercersburg school, *that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross is the only ground of our salvation.* This denial comes from one of the teachers in the Seminary at Lancaster, and who at this time claims to have the unquestionable endorsement of the Eastern Synod of our church. It is in these words: "A superficial study of the Heidelberg Catechism may make the impression that the atoning sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross, is not only essential but also fundamental and principal in its doctrinal system of redemption. That this doctrinal system underlies and animates the Heidelberg Catechism, we cannot believe."

Yet this doctrine that the death of Christ is the only foundation of our salvation, has always been considered as the corner-stone in the system of revealed truth—that it is a foundation truth. If Mercersburg takes away this stone, where will the penitent, believing sinner, look for hope? Should not the competent authority by which this Professor holds his place look to it that he does not injure, undermine or remove the foundations.

We have watched with painful solicitude for years the rhetorical legerdemain by which the Divine-human Redeemer was divested of His proper personality—removed from the efficient headship of the church, and in a sublimated form made to become the life that, as the gift of the church, is made over in baptism to believers. All this was *new* to those of us who believed that Christ, as the God-man, was in heaven at the right hand of God *for our intent*, who fondly believed that He was our Prophet, Priest and King, that by faith in prayer we had immediate and direct access to Him, and that from Him, directly and personally, we received remission of sins. But now we are to be robbed of the foundation of our hope as sinners, that we had a foundation for it in a *crucified* Redeemer. In our youth we were taught that the Holy Ghost *teaches* us in the Gospel, and assures us by the Sacraments, that the whole of our salvation depends upon the one sacrifice of Christ.

We appeal to the church as our mother. We are her *own* child—not a stranger—to know whether the foundations have been disturbed. We would not die believing a lie, or resting on a false foundation. We ask a thorough examination. If the foundations are loosened, if the rock—the corner-stone—is tampered with, deliver us from the consequences. We have held our faith as



taught in the Catechism, according to Paul, and received from the Holy Ghost. We are now in our old age shaken. Have we been taught a lie? Were all our fathers deceived? We importune our church to tell us: are Paul, the fathers, our Catechism, right? or, is Mercersburg right?

ULRIC.

## ?

DR. KRUMMACHER was once asked what he thought of Schleiermacher as a philosophical theologian? He replied: *Schleiermacher is an interrogation point.* This brief criticism is severely just. It means what is true, and has been proven true by the widely different and hostile parties which profess to build on the teachings of that notable man. He set forth his peculiar views in such a way that no one could say positively what he meant, and that he might be claimed alike by opposite theorists. At the end of his most learned writings there was always, so to speak, an interrogation point, (?) nothing was clearly settled.

Some may say that Krummacher was only an eloquent preacher, no philosopher, and hence incapable of appreciating "the great theologian." But whilst the chief excellence of Krummacher was his power as a preacher, it would be very unfair to deny that he was also a theologian of large attainments, and that he had a well-disciplined mind. He might not have been able to originate a new system of philosophy or theology, but he certainly had intelligence enough to understand and appreciate anything which the most profound or soaring theologian was justified in writing and publishing. If Schleiermacher wrote a book, or books, which, after being carefully read, left such a mind as Krummacher's in doubt as to what was meant or taught, not the reader, but the writer of the book, merits the blame.

This criticism may be fairly applied to the leading writers of the Lancaster school, so far, at least, as most readers of their published essays are concerned. To the majority, even of intelligent persons, they are *interrogation points*. With all their dogma-

tism and seeming profundity, the scores of articles they have been publishing for a score of years past, leave most of those who may have had the patience to read them, and who may have tried to understand them, in dark uncertainty as to what the writers really meant to teach. After all was gone over, the end was an interrogation point. This may be explained in several ways.

*First*, in many respects the writers themselves were on no certain ground. They had, in thought and heart, forsaken the old foundations, and were toiling in quagmires and bogs. Groping in the darkness of their own theological confusion, how could they be a light to others. Any one who has carefully observed their theological studies must have been convinced that they were men who had, in the main, let go the old faith of the church, and yet had not found another with which they were satisfied. They have publicly confessed that they were only "*in search of the truth.*" No wonder that, in their perplexity, they would often perplex others.

*Next*, we have their frequent *contradictions* of themselves. These contradictions have been numerous and glaring. Sometimes they have stood out in different columns of the same paper, or on different pages of the same review. These plump contradictions have often been exposed. They need not be again cited, excepting to give one of the latest as a specimen.

In the *Mercersburg Review* for April, 1873, we may read :

"Regarded from the point of observation here brought into view, *the old Catholic movement*, it must be allowed, does carry in it, as Dr. Reinkens intimates, *a bow of hope and promise for the world*, that may well fix upon it the serious attention of all who pray for the peace of Jerusalem." (Page 289.)

In the same *Review* for January, 1874, page 32, we read :

"His (Christ's) coming is *not heralded even remotely* as yet in any of the oriental churches ; *nor may we dare to acknowledge it in the old Catholic movement.*"

Now, these flatly contradictory assertions are not only found in the same *Review*, but are from the same pen, that of Dr. J. W. Nevin himself. As stated, many others quite as glaring, on far more vital points, have been exposed, and must have arrested the attention of more than one reader.

What can be done with such writers, better than put *interrogation points* after all they say? At one time they scout the term



*evangelical*, and move that it be struck out of a resolution offered at Synod. At another time they caress it as though it were precious to their hearts.

But whilst in this way their writings may, to most persons, be so annoyingly ambiguous, we maintain that they have been sufficiently explicit to make it clear that they have, in fundamental points, departed from the old established faith of the Reformed church, and, on the other hand, embraced views which are utterly irreconcilable with that faith. In Scripture language, "They have forsaken the fountain of living waters, and have hewn out for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, which can hold no water."

---

CRIES FOR PEACE.

THERE is something so pleasant in peace, and it is on so many accounts so desirable, that most persons delight in its prevalence, and deplore all interruptions of it. Appeals in favor of peace are, therefore, mostly popular, and those who make such appeals are commonly regarded with favor. This is especially true of peace in the church.

Now, remembering who hath said: "Blessed are the peacemakers," it will be readily admitted that to deplore and condemn strife and to advocate peace, *under proper circumstances, and upon proper conditions*, is not only commendable, but binding as a solemn duty upon every Christian man.

But this is not the only saying of our blessed "Prince of peace" which must be remembered. What He says with His own lips, and by the mouths of His inspired Apostles about the hostile character of the Gospel as opposed to error and sin, and "contending for the faith," and "resisting" teachers of false doctrine, *must also be kept in mind*. According to His word, and His example, and according to the admonitions and example of His Apostles, even *peace* (a false peace) may be purchased at too dear a rate. "I came not to send peace on the earth, but a sword."

When Jesus openly and severely rebuked the Scribes and Pharisees for setting the traditions of men higher than the command-

ments of God, did it mean peace or war? Had the priests and scribes been allowed to teach on in their own way their perverse doctrines substituted for the revealed truth of God, what contention and strife might have been saved the old Jewish church; what a quiet, peaceful time, they might have continued to enjoy.

When Peter and John (Acts IV) were cited before the Sanhedrim, to answer the charge of disturbing the peace, how easily they might have set all at rest by promising no longer to maintain and defend the truth against the false theology of those Jewish Doctors. But they refused to do this: Come of it what might, even the bitterest conflict, they would not betray the cause of truth for any peace-bribe which error and its advocates might offer.

Evidently, then, whilst it is right that all should study the things that make for peace, there are certain terms and conditions upon which this must be done, and which should not be disregarded in any efforts made to secure the desirable blessing. Above all, principles and doctrines which have always been held as essential and fundamental to true Christianity, must never be sacrificed or betrayed. And this not for the sake of the mere formal doctrines as such, but for the sake of their direct bearing upon our faith in God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ.

This now appears to be lost sight of in some strong appeals for peace recently made, and reiterated in "*Our Church Paper*," in the *Hausfreund*, (of which *Dr. Bausman* is Editor). The latter especially seems quite impatient with the strife which has been distracting our church, and begs for peace on almost any terms. The motive which may prompt such pleas may be fully appreciated. But they are calculated to make false impressions, and to do harm in other respects.

It must not be forgotten that the controversy arose from efforts made by the Professors of our Synodical institutions radically to change the doctrines of our church and her mode of worship. The beginning of the trouble is, therefore, to be traced directly to their doors. It would be as unjust to blame those who feel constrained to oppose such attempts with the troubles now disturbing peace, as it would be to charge the citizens of a state with sedition, for resisting an attempt to overthrow a good existing government.

Those who have been laboring for twenty years to revolutionize the Reformed church according to their own theological and other



notions, are the parties responsible for the dissensions now agitating the church. It was not only our right, but our solemn duty to expose and resist the revolutionizing measures, as soon as their true character was discovered.

Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that the interests involved in this unhappy controversy thus forced upon the church by the revolutionizing body named, are *vital*. The points at issue are not trifles about which members of the same church might well afford to differ. They concern doctrines which the true church from the days of the Apostles on, have ever considered and declared fundamental. These have been successively assailed or tampered with by the parties named. Of this fact the editors of the "*Hausfreund*" and "*Our Church Paper*," are fully aware. Unless we gratefully err, the editor of the "*Hausfreund*" differs very materially from what the Lancaster Theological Faculty has recently written on the subject of the Atonement, and on other related doctrines, and must have been grieved at the publication of those peculiar views.

Those views are held not as mere private opinions in a private way, but are officially announced as the convictions of those entrusted with the training of young men for the ministry of the Reformed church, and as convictions which they will, of course, diligently inculcate upon all under their tuition.

This makes the case a vital one. If the life, character, faith, of the Reformed church are essentially in harmony with the Gospel, and are worthy of being maintained, then one of two things must follow: either the Lancaster party must give up its errors, or the church must continue to resist them. But Lancaster has said repeatedly that it will not yield. How, then, can there be peace? Shall the Heidelberg Catechism, or rather the historical Gospel faith it represents, be tamely surrendered to the schemes and efforts of unsafe, unsettled theological speculations; and shall we quietly permit our church to be led back into Popish or ultra-Lutheran errors which it has been her noblest characteristic to reject?

The "*Hausfreund*" closes its appeal in this solemn style: "For God's sake, ye theological doctors and newspaper writers on both sides of the question, sheath your swords," &c. Why not rather turn to the advocates of the strange and subversive doctrines among us and say: For God's sake, brethren, cease disturbing

and unsettling our church with your theological novelties. Remember your solemn vows to teach, maintain and defend the established Gospel faith of your church, and instead of training young men to preach another Gospel, labor to fit them for the work of the ministry in harmony with our established faith and principles. Then will you be true to your duty, and faithful to the solemn trust which has been confided to your care. Other Reformed churches are not distracted by such attempts of their leading men, why will you persist in indulging your vain speculations, and in forcing them upon us.

In this connection the subject suggests some other points which might justly be noticed. But, as they might be thought rather personal, and are of comparatively minor account, we forbear. Only in conclusion let it be remarked, that there is one certain and proper way of securing peace, and it is a simple one. Let the "*Hausfreund*," and others of its mind, come out, however kindly and temperately, yet openly and kindly, and let the church know what changes in our faith and practice the party represented by Lancaster proposes to effect. Tell out the whole truth. *That* will go farther to check and suppress the evils now troubling and endangering the church, than any mere verbal appeals. How it will do this, need not be stated.

---

HEAR Baxter's own heart-stirring thoughts on the best style of preaching: "How few ministers do preach with all their might! or speak about everlasting joy or torment in such a manner as to make men believe that they were in good earnest. It would make a man's heart ache to see a company of dead and drowsy sinners sit under a minister, and not have a word that is like to quicken or awaken them. To think with ourselves, 'O, if these sinners were convinced and awakened they might yet be converted and live. And, alas! we speak so drowsily or gently, that sleepy sinners cannot hear. The blow falls so light that hard-hearted persons cannot feel it.'"



## Arsinus College Repertory.

### INFLUENCE OF HABIT ON MORAL CHARACTER.

[Continuing the publication of the addresses delivered at the recent anniversary of the Zwinglian Literary Society, our readers will find below that of *E. G. Williams*, of the Junior Class, and of *S. M. Hench*, of the Freshman Class.]

BESIDES attention to business and to the acquisition of a knowledge of that trade or profession to which the attention may be directed in life, there is such a thing as the formation of character, or fixed habits of action arising out of fixed principles. The fact that these fixed principles constitute the vital shaping force of character—the universal and most essential element of manhood—seems to be an adequate reason why we should attempt to investigate them, and ascertain the influence which they exert in the formation of moral character. Without adding to our other knowledge this acquisition also, we cannot fully meet the injunction, “Know thyself;” nor lay broad the foundation of knowledge in any understanding of that intellect which is at once the recipient and interpreter of all knowledge; nor introduce into the structure of character such a variety of true and right principles which, in the conception of our Creator, were designed to shape and adorn it.

Man, as a free being, follows his natural promptings according to his estimate of good and evil; his passionate excitement; and the example of others through imitation or sympathy. His anatomy and physiology both claim and demonstrate that the purpose and design of the human constitution is activity. The circumstances and conditions of life; of that animating power which establishes a circle of internal relations, and maintains these in constant adjustment with external relations, involve the necessity of action. Effort must be put forth for the maintenance of exist-

ence, and for the gratification of the various desires of human nature.

But we do not form character 'by action simply, but by acting according to certain principles; principles which deepen in meaning, broaden in time, and affect the relations of actions. Our lives are shaped not only under acts performed, but under laws or principles obeyed. If, therefore, the formation of character consists in action founded on principles; and if the lines of action which are momentarily initiated, and become momentarily more and more unmanageable in the good or evil that flows from them, are based on principles, then truly all the obligations of life demand and constrain us carefully to choose all our principles of action.

What, then, are the principles which produce, shape, and control good moral character? We answer, unhesitatingly, principles founded on truth and right, because the central fact of our nature is a perception of right; on truth, because truth is the agreement of action with the perception of right; not truth and right latent in thought, but potent in action, truth and right passing into the heart, and thence through the will into that only great product of man, conduct or character. We must not only think the truth and the right, but feel them and act in accordance with them. That which is highest in man is a loving apprehension of the true and the right, and that which is highest in character is the victory of these over error and wrong. That, therefore, constitutes the true moral character of an individual which is the mark of a spirit loyal to truth and right. Human nature is diversified by many and various springs of action. We are influenced from within and from without. Any slight or moderate pleasure frequently repeated for a long time, forms a peculiar connection between us and that which causes the pleasure. This connection has the effect of awakening in us a desire or appetite for that thing when it does not return as usual. During the course of enjoyment the pleasure slowly increases until a habit is established. Habit, then, is the method, the ever-returning mode which the action of the individual assumes.

A habit is weak in its beginning, but from that time it slowly and steadily gains strength. It fortifies itself with accustomed usage, arms itself with the potent power of possession, and enclosed within the double association of the past and present, is



firmly entrenched against all changes. It exerts a subtle influence over our judgments, concealing from us the defects of those actions and things which it has previously sanctioned. It pre-occupies the ground with strong feelings of its own, and many of the preferences to which it gives rise, are the severest and most pernicious prejudices—prejudgments in favor of that which familiarity and accustomed usage has rendered agreeable.

Habit weakens the feelings. An act or state which is habitual, addresses the feelings less strongly than that which is rare and new ; and our familiarity with actions and states, whether repulsive or pleasant, has always the effect to weaken the impression made upon the feelings to which they give rise. Habit begets a certain dullness of the faculties by which they come more easily to endure continued and dangerous evil, and to experience less enjoyment from protracted pleasure ; thus, on either hand, weakening and softening down the intensity of the feelings, and, consequently, thereby weakening and perverting our moral perceptions. Habit, when once violated, has great power of inflicting discomfort, and the more unreasonable and pernicious the habit has been, the more severe and protracted the penalty of pain will be with which it afflicts its unhappy victim. “In this respect it is like the momentum of a body which does not show itself till an effort be made to check the motion ; then it becomes deadly, and sends the ball crashing and bruising through all impeding obstacles. Habit is often but the momentum of the body, or the heart, or the mind, impelled by which it runs along in a rut of indulgence or indolence, and cannot be lifted out.”

Habit deceives the conscience. If a method or course of action is established, the human mind very often fails to investigate its underlying principles, and, consequently, fails to enlighten the conscience, which decides upon them as they are cast up. Persons under this habitual influence, act according to the prevailing views of their age and country, without making any inquiry into the moral bearing of the action. “They follow religiously the superstitions of their country ; they practice faithfully the virtues of their family or tribe—be they hospitality, or courage, or whatever else ; and they allow themselves to fall into the vices that abound around them—it may be intemperance or revenge—and they scarcely feel any compunctions in consequence.” The mind avoids inquiry, because it does not wish to be disturbed. “The

conscience, in such persons, loses all delicacy of perception and touch ; and the possessor does good without doing it as good, and evil without knowing that it is evil."

Even where habit is on the side of virtue, in the very support of which it renders the right, it is greatly liable to make our actions more and more mechanical, to leave us satisfied with a stolid repetition of the accustomed past, rather than to incite us to higher and more perfect realizations, to bolder and more determined progress in the active duties of life.

Habit, therefore, as tending to restrain and impair our free judgment, and prejudice the noble powers of our own minds, to mislead and weaken the feelings, and to commit our whole nature to the blind guidance of accustomed action, needs most carefully be watched over, and as far as possible be guarded against. Its dominion is everywhere, and all the chronic evils of life will be found sheltered and entrenched in it.

But habits have also advantages when based on true and right principles. Habit, when thus formed, is the ease of confirmed virtue, the grace of good breeding, the skill of disciplined powers, the assurance of consolidated strength in all the active duties of life. Most to be feared, and most to be sought, the inflexible mould in which our life is ever cooling, the unchangeable pattern into which it is ever setting, it demands momentary revision and constant watchfulness.

To the formation of good habits, it is necessary that the intellect is properly informed in regard to principles founded on truth and right, and the means of acting in accordance with them, that the feelings or desires be moulded according to these principles. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance carefully to weigh every action of our lives, and every train of thought that we encourage in our minds ; for we cannot tell the effect of a single act, or a single mental process, in giving that influence to the character, the result of which will be decisive and permanent.

Shall we, therefore, mar our character by habituating ourselves to profligacy, which is followed by remorse, disease and embarrassment ; to intemperance, which has in its train peevishness, an impaired constitution, and a premature death ; to idleness and negligence, which bring after them disorder in our affairs, and consequent poverty and ruin ; or shall we cultivate traits of integrity, uprightness, industry and honor. The power to accomplish •



either is in our own hands, and, consequently, let us cultivate such a character that the world cannot look with contempt on our being, and so act that we may be an honor to ourselves, to our neighborhood, to our country, and to our God.

E. G. W.

---

#### THE DIVINE AND THE HUMAN.

MAN, endowed by his Creator with the faculties of mind and soul, is thereby capacitated for knowledge and a high degree of excellence. Within the human mind has been implanted a longing after truths, a desire to investigate, to know, and to understand. But the mind of man is finite. His powers of intellect are circumscribed, and, consequently, beyond such circumscription his every attempt to grasp and comprehend the Infinite being, with His attributes and works, is ineffectual. All is mystery. His own existence is wrapped in mystery. Though he beholds much in nature which he partially comprehends, he discerns not wholly the design of Infinite wisdom and power. That there is a great first cause, that we reverently call God, it seems to us no rational creature has a right to doubt. The visible works of creation have a language too plain to be mistaken. Even from the most minute object, up to the greatest and most magnificent display of creative skill in the universe, comes a silent testimony more eloquent than ever fell from human lips. The pencil of an Angelo, or a Raphael, would fail to delineate the smallest flower as does the hand that adorns the earth with a mantle of green. In reducing material things to their elements, we find but few simples composing all matter, though in endless variety, yet perfect harmony and order pervade the whole. But the objects claiming our attention as proofs of a supreme being, are not confined to the narrow limits of this habitable globe. Were there none beyond, these would be sufficient. To the astronomer, those glittering orbs presents a rare scene for grandeur and reflection. While his eye follows their unnumbered hosts through space, what can be the thoughts which occupy his mind? Can he do aught but stand in awe and admiration? Can man contemplate all these and be a

disbeliever in a Creator? Men almost universally agree that there is a God. Yet while many acknowledge that a Great Father controls the universe, there are few who believe in a Divine Providence in human affairs. Few believe in the beautiful doctrine of Shakspeare, that "there is a Divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we will." Many believe in fate or in circumstances. Materialism claims for its votaries some of the most gifted minds. But all the scientific speculations placed in the balance over against light and truth, with the brilliant minds possessing them, are as nothing. There are those who believe in the doctrine that, shape our lives as best we can, the reign of destiny will continually reappear. Such a faith is contrary to reason and the Bible. Their philosophy amounts to this: that it matters not how much we may do for ourselves, or how much a kind Providence may do for us, there is an uncontrollable destiny that will shape our lives. Should this become the faith of mankind, it would rob the world of its best thoughts, tenderest sympathies, and noblest actions. Moulding our convictions in that form of expression, we would say, shape our lives as best we can, the golden reign of Divine Providence will continually reappear.

There is a Divinity that shapes the lives of individuals, it matters not how dignified or humble their stations. Our own consciences bear testimony to this. In our quiet moments of reflection, if we enter the inner temples of our natures and commune with ourselves, do we not sometimes feel the mysterious presence of another? We often act contrary to what we had previously determined, and seemingly without any reason of our own. We plan castles that we never build, and build castles that we never planned. The humble shepherds watching their flocks on the plains of Judea, recognized a Divine Providence in human affairs. Newton recognized the Divine and the human in his whole life. By studying the biographies of illustrious men, we find that they, with but few exceptions, have acknowledged a mysterious, uncontrollable tide in their lives, as independent of volition as the pulsations of the heart itself.

What is true in this respect of individuals, is also true of nations. There is a divinity that shapes the destiny of nations. History is a record of God's Providence in the rise and fall of nations. It is true some of the great historians have denied any superhuman interposition in the affairs of nations. Gibbon has



written the decline and fall of the great Empire of the Cæsars, and has found the cause in kings, warriors and statesmen; in policies, institutions and parties. Hume has portrayed the rise of the English nation from barbarism to civilization, from despotism to liberalism, and has found the cause of its rapid growth in circumstances, and in the inherent qualities of Englishmen. The facts of history rise up in condemnation of their doctrine, and prove that a higher than human agency controls the storms of national life. Events from the history of almost any nation would serve to illustrate this. But take a few from some of the most distinguished nations of the modern period, and they establish this truth beyond a doubt. The English revolution of sixteen hundred and eighty-eight, and the issues of that period of the seventeenth century, form one of the memorable epochs in history. Take the facts of those revolutions, and an attempt to elucidate them satisfactorily, independent of Deity, is impossible. What shall we say of the abdication of James the Second? What of the peaceful elevation of the Prince of Orange? What of the disastrous end of the intrigues of Louis the Fourteenth, to reinstate the English king? So it was with all the attempts of the French to overthrow the Protestant religion. Those denying any superhuman agency in national affairs can say, that the abdication of the last of the Stuarts was the natural consequence of his own course of action; that the elevation of the Prince of Orange to the English throne was wholly owing to his ability and statesmanship; that the failure of Louis to reinstate the house of Stuart, to devastate Germany and overthrow the Protestant faith, was the result of his want of forethought and genius. Thus explaining those events, they lose their meaning, and history all its philosophy. They no longer stand as the central facts around which the history of the seventeenth century gathers, and in which is to be found its interpretation; but admit the presence of a Divine agency controlling those affairs, and they become full of meaning. They are no longer the result of genius and ability on one hand, and the want of them on the other. The last of the Stuarts attempted to rob the the English nation of its religion and liberties, and God thrust the deluded man from his place. The Prince of Orange was the defender of the most cherished of human institutions. Religious liberty and a Divine Providence made him ruler of the English nation.

The Bourbon did not fail in his attempts to overthrow the Protestant religion from the want of his brilliant exploits. It was not his lack of ability that turned his wisdom in folly, overmastered his generalship, and soiled the lilies of France with the dust of defeat. It was no man or party of men that directed and controlled those great events. They who seemed to marshal them, were only instruments; and each of these determined the course of events of which he was the centre, as the rudder determines the course of a ship. The history of that period is simply the history of one of the many conflicts between Catholicism and Protestantism; and Protestantism triumphed, because behind the shadow of the dim unknown was God, keeping watch o'er His own.

The late sudden humiliation of France and exaltation of the German Empire, have been wholly attributed to men and circumstances, thereby failing to give honor to Him to whom the honor is due. During the conflict through which our own nation but recently passed, there was a certain drift of events for which the wisdom of the wisest could not account, and for which they were in no way responsible. They all show clearly how little the apparent actors in the great drama had to do with its inspiration. That majestic drift of events which so ruthlessly overthrew policies and prophecies, thrones and men, reveals clearly the hand of God in history. Though Gibbon and Hume have ignored a higher than human agency in history, and have found the causes of natural prosperity and adversity in men, circumstances and destiny; though Hugo has taught the grossest materialism, and Voltaire published the darkest infidelity, yet the sentiments and opinions of these great men shall never divorce us from the simple belief, "that the golden woof of a Divine Providence runs through the web of individual and national life;" and in support of this we take the opinions of the vast majority of great men, every page of history, the progress of free government and free schools, the triumphs of our religion, the silent and majestic march of civilization down the course of centuries, and, above all, the gift of a Saviour to the world.

S. M. H.

---

RESOLVE to be brief, as this is an age of telegraphs and stenography.



## SPECIAL ITEMS.

*The Annual Catalogue* for 1873-4 is in the hands of the printer, and will be ready for distribution in two or three weeks. It will be found to contain a highly encouraging exhibit of the condition of the Institution. One of the most cheering facts connected with our College experience during the current accademic year, could not be set forth in the Catalogue, namely, that there has been *a larger number of permanent students in the College during the present year than at any previous time*. This is one of the most satisfactory evidences of progress and growth, and inspires confident hopes for the future.

*Arrangements* have been made for a *Concert of Sacred Music, &c.*, in the Chapel Hall of the College, on the evening of May 14 or 15. The Choir of the Race Street Reformed church, Philadelphia, has kindly and generously consented to give such an entertainment, not only for the pleasure of those who will be glad to enjoy so excellent a musical treat as that Choir is abundantly able to furnish, but in aid of furnishing the Hall. The selections of music will be choice, and we feel perfectly safe in promising that the execution of the pieces selected, will meet the highest expectations. The Race Street Church Choir, under its accomplished amateur Organist, is considered one of the very best in Philadelphia. We only regret that our esteemed personal friend, the organist, cannot bring his organ with him. He will be provided, however, with one of the best smaller instruments made.

*The next Commencement, June 25*, we are happy to learn, is looked forward to with warm expectations by many friends in all sections of the church. It is meant to be a grand reunion occasion. The graduating class will consist this year of six members. The *Ursinus Union*, and all interested in its principles and aims, will meet on Tuesday evening, June 23 for consultation and action in regard to such matters as may be submitted to it. It is desired and hoped that the attendance will be full. As far as possible friends from a distance will be privately entertained, and beyond this arrangements will be made for comfortable and pleasant public accommodations upon reasonable terms. Only let all consider themselves *engaged* to be here during Commencement-week. Due notice will be given of such arrangements as may be made with railroads for Excursion tickets.

## EDITORS' DESK.

Our readers probably noticed that the April number of the "*Monthly*" contained sixty-four pages instead of fifty-six. The enlargement of that issue was an after-thought, adopted to admit the extra amount of matter on hand. This will explain a seeming discrepancy in the apology offered for the supposed necessary curtailment of the *Desk* department, which, however, was afterwards extended to its usual limits. To equalize matters, the present issue will be found to contain but forty-eight pages.

---

"*The Christian World*"—*New Arrangement.* It has long been felt that the *Eastern* portion of the church, needed an English *weekly* journal to represent and defend fully and fairly the established faith and practice of the church. The so-called "*Reformed Church Messenger*," by its surrender of its columns and influence to the leading tenets of the high-church, ritualistic party, had largely lost the confidence of former friends, and "*The Christian World*," although staunch in its maintenance of Reformed principles against ritualistic innovations, and otherwise an excellent family religious newspaper, was regarded as so much of a Western publication that its circulation was, on this account, somewhat restricted. To meet the case as satisfactorily as possible under existing circumstances, an arrangement has been effected by which the East will, in *form* as well as in *fact*, secure what has been desired. An *Eastern Department* has been generously yielded by those having the control of our esteemed Western paper, which is under the entire management and direction of the *Rev. S. H. Reid*, of Milton, as the eastern editor. Brother Reid has entered upon his work in good earnest, and in the numbers thus far issued has proven that he knows what to do in his new editorial capacity, and how to do it vigorously. The "*Monthly*" extends a cordial welcome to the "*Christian World*" under its new arrangement, and rejoices in the additional aid thus given to the common cause in which both are engaged, and which each can now serve with fresh courage and hope. For the present, the office of the Eastern department of the *Christian World*, is located in Milton, and all communications intended for it are to be addressed to *Rev. S. H. Reid*, Milton, Pa. The *terms* of the paper will be the same as heretofore. This arrangement is not intended at all as a substitute for the "*Reformed Church Monthly*," but rather as auxiliary, in the more popular weekly form, in the cause to which both publications are devoted. The two periodicals fully understand each other. They are based upon the same evangelical Reformed principles, animated by the same spirit, and ruled by the same determined purpose of fidelity and genuine loyalty to the faith and life of the Reformed church. Each will work in its own way, but both for the same important end. Let each receive the cordial support of all who desire that our Reformed faith and practice shall be maintained against the artful and persistent efforts of the *new* theology ritualists to pervert it.

---

*Cheering Progress.* The cause of the church of our fathers, and of the evan-



gelical faith of our church, in distinction from the serious and culpable perversions of it attempted by the Lancaster party, is evidently gaining ground every day. A few years ago, say when the "*Monthly*" was started, it was common for the self-confident ringleaders of the ritualistic movement to sneer at the opposition to their revolutionary schemes, as being one-handed and contemptibly insignificant and weak. More than one Sanballat derided it, and foretold the speedy suppression of the "sedition." Our "*Monthly*" came in for its full share of mockery and railing. Some felt sure that it would take only a puff of breath from the ritualistic Eolus to blow it clear to the other side of the sea. We were repeatedly declared to be the only person of any account who withstood the new-order schemes. This was known to be false by those who made the assertion, but as the paper in which the falsehood was published would not correct it, it served the purpose of uttering it. Various attempts were made to crush the "*Monthly*," and us, too, for that matter. But all those malicious and bitter attempts failed? The biter was bitten, and even the terrible false indictment which a Synod was led under special partisan pressure inwardly to adopt, recoiled like an overloaded blunderbuss upon those who used it.

But a few years have effected great changes. The leading advocates of the new theology, however ready to employ questionable methods in furtherance of their cause, would hardly risk saying now that the opposition to their audacious attempt to subvert and revolutionize the faith of the Reformed church, included only a contemptible faction in the East, with an equally contemptible Synod of abettors in the West, and some *cyphers* from North Carolina. There are *four* church periodicals arrayed in the common defence of our established faith against the new-order theology, whilst there are but *two* which openly and avowedly defend and try to propagate that pernicious theology. And the circulation of those four is at least about three times larger than that of the two. Then there are papers under the control of editors who, to a greater or less extent, sympathize with the Lancaster movement, but who so well know the sentiment of the church at large upon the subject, that prudence and policy prompt them to unfurl at least what purports to be a neutral flag. They do not and they dare not tell their readers fairly and fully what Lancaster is doing, and what it is teaching in its own peculiar way. This is significant.

Another proof of the advancement of our cause is found in the fact that the number of its open and earnest advocates is increasing. For a long time many stood in doubt, holding a sort of neutral position. Like the rest of us at the start of the revolutionizing movement, they were slow to believe that the Synod's professors really meant what they said and wrote, and were disposed to put a construction on their words which would shield them from a charge of gross inconsistency with official vows and obligations. Fuller developments, however, convinced them that it was really and essentially *another gospel* which was preached. This made their duty plain, and they are coming out boldly and earnestly in their opposition to that new gospel. Who they are we do not know, in some instances, and have not inquired. It is enough for us that they are adding to the weight of testimony borne against the injurious innovations, and are making Lancaster and its adjuncts feel more and more keenly

that our apostolic Reformed faith is too deeply rooted in the hearts of too many devoted ministers and members of our church, to be easily plucked up and cast off as a thing despised.

A little more patience, a little more earnest and persevering effort, and the evils which have been so wretchedly distracting the church will be overcome. Then we shall have the desired peace, and that peace fixed more firmly than ever upon the old foundations, made doubly precious for having withstood such violent and deceitful attempts to undermine and destroy them.

*Signs of weakness*, and of weakness painfully felt by the party concerned, are plainly showing themselves in recent articles from the pens of the Theological Faculty at Lancaster. One of the strongest proofs of a sense of such failing strength is furnished by the refuge taken to assertions which are not only untrue, but which the writers of them might (if not must) know to be untrue. From but two such articles, published since April 21st, we cull as many as the six following untruthful statements, to which the party named has felt itself driven in defense of its bad cause.

1. "Our theology has been clear and outspoken in declaring that there is grace in baptism, as a necessary element of the Sacraments, that in baptism the child is washed by the blood and Spirit of Christ, as explained in our Catechism. *This is held up as heresy.*"

This is not true, and if the writer did not know that he was stating an untruth in making this assertion, he is guilty of culpable ignorance. Neither our *Monthly* nor the "*Christian World*" has ever called the doctrine of baptism, as set forth in the above extract, a heresy. Indeed, the extract contains a double untruth. It represents Lancaster theology as teaching a doctrine of baptism which it does not teach, and it misrepresents us as charging that doctrine with being heresy. *We hold* the doctrine as taught and explained in the Catechism, and by the authors of the Catechism, and by the entire Reformed church, Lancaster excepted. Lancaster, as has been incontrovertibly proven, rejects that doctrine and advocates a view wholly at variance with its *Th. i Lancaster Baptismal regeneration by the conveyance of a portion of the substance of the theanthropic nature* (assumed by L.) of Jesus Christ—this it is we denounce as heresy. And the Theological Faculty at Lancaster knows that this is so. Why, then, this gross misstatement? The only answer we can give is, because of a conscious weakness of their cause, and a purpose to deceive.

2. "There has been quite a good deal of vague and irresponsible opposition to the teachings of the church."

Here is another glaring misstatement of the same sort as the preceding one. Like it, too, it contains two in one; is a double untruth. *First*, it claims that the vain and hurtful theological speculations of Lancaster are "*the teachings of the church.*" How false, as well as impudently presumptuous this claim is, is too manifest to need proof. It seems hardly possible to think that men pretending to be as well informed as they do, are ignorant of what the plainest readers of their articles know, and of what Prof. Fritschel (the ultra-Lutheran of Iowa) has openly told them, that besides departing from the faith of the Reformed



church on other points, they have virtually adopted the ultra-Lutheran doctrine of the Sacraments. The *second* untruth in the assertion is, that the opponents of the Lancaster errors are opposing "*the teachings of the church.*" To this, as a *third*, might be added the assertion, that the opposition has been "*vague and irresponsible*" (by the way, this is also a *twin*.) So far from being *vague*, our resistance to the new theology has been considerably more definite than its advocates liked. The assaults upon the errors of that theology have been only too direct and telling, as effects have proven. And as regards *responsibility*, Lancaster, with all its self-exaltation, knows it has nothing to boast of over its opponents.

3. "*The teachings of the church seem to them to be all wrong.*" Here again is the false assumption that the gross errors of Lancaster theology are the teachings of the Reformed church. Not only do we deny the pretension, but Lancaster itself has, in other places, confessed its departure from the historical faith of the church, and has even tried to vindicate itself for indulging in such departures.

It is, again, *not* the teachings of the church, *but* those of the Theological Faculty at Lancaster which the opposition pronounces wrong, and has proven to be false.

4. "Is Christianity a life, but not a life flowing from Christ, which involves pantheism, *as it is said?*" This is another misstatement. Nobody has ever said that to maintain that Christianity is a life, and a life flowing from Christ, is pantheism. And the writer could and should have known that nobody ever said so. The pantheism of the Lancaster theology consists in its avowed doctrine, that this life is given or obtained in the form of the transmission of the life-substance of God to man, and this is pantheism in one of its most deceptive forms. *This is the error which has been denounced.* And they know it.

5. "Changing its charges. How charges are self-contradictory." Another misstatement. Adding counts to an indictment is not changing the indictment. The charges have not been changed, but multiplied, as, alas, Lancaster by its progressive development in error gave occasion for multiplying them. Neither are the charges contradictory. There have been both pantheistic and infidel papists, before and since the day when one of the Popes called the Gospel pleasant fables. Brahmin priests are pantheists, sacerdotalists, and idolators. So the Theological Faculty at Lancaster, and their theology may be (as it has been proven to be by its own declarations) pantheistic in its views of the relation of the Creator to His creatures, and yet out-and-out Popish in its views of the constitution of the church, of the sacraments, of the priesthood, &c. The fact is, that all sacerdotal high-churchism is latitudinarian on all points not directly affecting high-church tenets. The Episcopal church of England will not tolerate a minister who neglects to use its ritualistic liturgy as prescribed, but it can tolerate the half-infidel bishop Colenso.

Hence, the charges of the opposition to Lancaster theology are not contradictory, and the Faculty, one should think, must know it.

6. "The full meaning of the opposition can be understood only by knowing the views they hold. *These they are careful not to give, it is true.*" This is *not* true, and the writer had abundant opportunity to know it, if he knows, as he

ought, what the generally received theology of the Reformed church is. The opposition has openly and repeatedly, negatively and positively, defined its position.

Now, why does Lancaster resort to such means as these to shield and defend itself? Plainly, because it feels itself driven to desperate extremes. But can such fraudulent devices prevail? Never, in the end. "Be truthful," let come what may.

Of the unbounded, as well as farcically grave assumption of this Lancaster coterie of theological highfalutins in CLAIMING TO be THE CHURCH, there is no need of writing in earnest, and we have no time just now for sport.

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

FROM *Scribner, Armstrong & Co.*, 654 Broadway, New York.

*What is Darwinism?* By Charles Hodge, D.D., of Princeton Theological Seminary.

Darwinism is one of those things in physics which, like a certain other *ism* in theology, may be fairly designated with an interrogation point (?) Not that its true character is really above or beyond discovery. The main cause of perplexity is that it stoutly denies being what gives every proof of being, and tries to neutralize a verdict of guilt by very earnest and dignified protestations of innocence.

Such scientific or theological chameleons are hard to treat. In brain and heart, bone and sinew, blood and lymph, they remain unchanged. But they have such cunning ways of puffing themselves up, and then contracting themselves, of changing not only the color of their skin but the very features of their face, tone of their voice, and even their speech itself, to suit occasions, that it might almost puzzle a Champolion to say positively what they are.

In some cases it might be best to let such ambiguous things alone, and have all the amusement of their antic variations to themselves. Often, however, they are perniciously deceptive and must be exposed. Of this sort is Darwinism. We are glad, therefore, that one so competent as Dr. Hodge has subjected it to a brief but sharp dissection and laid bare its insidious atheism. The book should be widely circulated and carefully read, especially by any who may be exposed to the hurtful influence of this latest and most specious form of anti-Christianity. The first and third articles of this excellent number have been read with great interest, and deserve to be commended to special attention. To some things in that on infant baptism we cannot subscribe. But the article, as a whole, exhibits careful thought, great earnestness, and presents many views worthy of consideration. It has arrested the attention of Lancaster, but only in a partisan way. Apart from points at which Lancaster cavils, it contains suggestions which that erratic school should lay to heart. Its argu-



ment in defence of infant baptism against the assaults of Baptists, is far stronger than any Lancaster has ever offered, or can offer, on its magical theory of baptismal regeneration.

*The Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Eclectic.* Vol. XXXI. April, 1874. Andover: W. F. Draper, Publisher. The following table of contents will give a good idea of the value of this able quarterly: The Foundations of Theology Sure, Galilee in the Time of Christ, Baptism of Infants and their Church Membership, Herbert Spencer's Religion, On a Passage (Matt. xxvi. 50,) History in Alphabets, Remarks on Müller's *Die Lemiten*; Parthia, the Rival of Rome, Notices of Recent Publications. Every minister, especially, would derive much profit from this magazine. Edward A. Parke, of Andover, Mass., and George E. Day, of New Haven, Connecticut, are the editors. Terms, \$4 a year.

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

### MEMORIAL OBITUARY OF THE REV. BENJ. S. SCHNECK, D.D.

WITH a sad heart and a trembling hand we devote the first place in the Summary for this month to a memorial of the beloved brother of whose comparatively sudden death most of our readers have been informed through other sources.

After a brief illness with pleuro-pneumonia, which did not seem to present very alarming symptoms until the third day of the attack, he passed away in the calm confidence of an assured Christian hope, at two o'clock on Sunday morning, April 19th. The tidings of his death soon spread through the town and made that Lord's day one of general grief for Chambersburg. And as the sad event was immediately communicated by telegraph and letters to friends in different parts of the church, hundreds at a distance joined in the sorrow occasioned by his unexpected and lamented removal from the fellowship of those who loved him on earth.

Our departed brother was born on March 13th, 1806, in what was then a suburb of Reading, Pa., but is now included within the limits of that rapidly growing city. His parents, originally from Westphalia, Germany, on first arriving in this country settled in Philadelphia, and afterwards removed to Reading. They were members of the church, and sincere Christians of what some derisively call the Pietistic type; that is, they held to a living, personal piety, in distinction from mere nominal sacramental formalism. This, indeed, was the character of the great majority of the early Reformed immigrants to this country, both ministers and other members. He accordingly enjoyed the blessings of such household piety, and such a religious training as distinguished the homes of parents who cherished and maintained a living, personal Christianity.

His father was, by profession, a school teacher, in the old German Reformed sense, the school being a part of the congregation, and under its general care. As usual in such cases, the profession of Organist for the congregation was associated with that of teaching. In this capacity he served first the Race Street Reformed church in Philadelphia, and then the Reformed church in Reading.

Under such tuition *the son* passed his earlier years, and, at a suitable age, after due preparation of mind and heart, was admitted by confirmation to the privileges of full membership in the church, thus personally assuming the vows to which he had been committed in infancy by baptism, and appropriating the grace of which it was a sign and seal.

He next engaged for a time as a clerk in a store in Reading. But such was his thirst for knowledge, and probably at that time already his desire to fit himself for the work of the ministry, that he diligently improved all his leisure moments by reading and study. As his father could render him no pecuniary assistance, he had to struggle on by his own efforts, procuring such books as his limited means enabled him to buy. The real aim of his heart is indicated by the fact that among the books thus purchased were Latin and Greek grammars and lexicons with corresponding text-books. Toiling in this way to build upon the slender foundation of an ordinary school education, he made good progress in his course, no doubt encouraged by his pastor and friends, who discovered the bent of his spirit, and that he possessed more than ordinary natural abilities. Accordingly, after a few years, we find him associated with other pious young men of like mind, pursuing a theological course of study under the care and instruction of the Rev. L. F. Herman, D.D., who then resided in Falconer Swamp, and in connection with his pastoral work maintained a private theological school, in the exercise of his official right as an ordained minister of the Gospel.

In September, 1825, Dr. Schneck, then but a little over nineteen years of age, was licensed to preach the Gospel by the "*Free Synod*," of which Dr. Herman was a prominent member, and which held its annual sessions that fall in Salem's Reformed church. That Synod had been organized some time previously by a number of Reformed ministers and elders, who felt themselves aggrieved by what they considered some unjustifiable acts and measures of the General (Eastern) Synod. A year later, September 5th, 1826, our departed brother was ordained at the annual sessions of the Free Synod in Reamstown, Lancaster county, Pa., and immediately took charge of a number of scattered and feeble congregations in Centre county, Pa. His labors in this extensive field were necessarily arduous, but they were also very successful, and his memory was ever afterwards gratefully cherished by a large circle of members and friends, for whose spiritual welfare he had so faithfully toiled. We had an opportunity of personally learning this fact during a first visit to the vicinity of his labors in the autumn of 1838, on the occasion of the dedication of the Loop church, then under the pastoral care of the late lamented Rev. P. S. Fisher, (a former theological classmate of brother Schneck.) Resigning his charge in Centre county early in 1833, he took a short respite from stated labors until in Sep-



tember, 1834, he became pastor of the Gettysburg charge. Meantime, in 1828, he withdrew from the Free Synod and united with the General (Eastern) Synod of the Reformed church. The term of his pastorate in Gettysburg was of brief duration, however, in consequence of failing health; (chiefly a bronchial affection, if we mistake not), which compelled him to resign the charge in the autumn of 1835. But unwilling to be idle in the vineyard, he at once yielded to the solicitations of a number of friends who desired the establishment of a weekly religious journal in place of the semi-monthly "*Messenger of the Reformed Church*." Accordingly he removed to Chambersburg, and there founded the "*Weekly Messenger*,"\* which is mainly indebted to his editorial ability, and to his untiring zeal for the success which attended the first ten or fifteen years of its publication. True to the church himself, and cherishing its genuine faith in his inmost heart, he ever made the paper serve the cause of that faith and the best interests of the Reformed church. This speaks well not only for himself and his fidelity to the trust committed to him, but also for the influence of his former theological instructor. His connection with the *Messenger* as chief editor was continued, with a slight interval, until 1852.

In addition to the labors devolving upon him as editor of the *Messenger*, Dr. Schneck also had charge of the "*Reformirte Kirchenzeitung*," which he continued to edit, excepting during an interval of several years (1852-57), until the destruction of the printing establishment in 1864, and its removal to Philadelphia.

Besides these editorial toils, he preached frequently and at different periods, as stated supply of congregations in the neighborhood of Chambersburg. From 1855 to the time of his lamented death, he was pastor of St. John's (German) Reformed church in Chambersburg, a feeble flock, but upon which he bestowed the tenderest care, a labor of love warmly appreciated by the afflicted members of that now desolate flock.

At the time of his departure he was also engaged as professor of German in Wilson Female College, at Chambersburg, where his services were highly prized, and by the friends of which his death is deeply deplored.

The funeral took place on Tuesday afternoon, April 21st. The whole town may be said to have participated in the solemnities, and to have united in one general sorrow. There was a double service, one at the house and another at Zion's Reformed church. The former was opened by the Rev. Dr. Bausman, with some appropriate passages of Scripture. The Rev. Dr. Davis, pastor of Zion's church, then made some suitable remarks, tenderly referring to the sad occasion with special regard to the sorely bereaved, deeply afflicted surviving partner of the departed brother. He was followed by the Rev. Dr. Kennedy of the Presbyterian church, in a most appropriate address. A prayer was then offered by the Rev. J. A. Crawford, and the benediction pronounced by the Rev. Dr. S. W. Crawford, of the Reformed Presbyterian church. The funeral procession was then formed, and the precious remains were taken from their

---

\* For a number of these facts, and especially dates, we are indebted to an editorial of Dr. Fisher, in the *Messenger*.

earthly home to the church, and thence borne to their resting-place in the graveyard overshadowed by the church. At the head of the long procession were the stricken members of the German congregation, mourning as for a father taken from them.

The chief services of the sad occasion were held in the church in the following order: Invocation, by Rev. J. Hassler. Hymn, by Rev. I. N. Hays. Reading of the 90th Psalm, by Rev. Dr. Gerhart, and of 1 Corinthians 15, by Rev. W. F. Colliflower. Prayer, by Rev. Dr. F. W. Kremer. A brief sketch of the deceased by the pastor, Rev. Dr. Davis. An address by the writer, based on the words of St. Paul, "*I have kept the faith*," followed by another address by Rev. Dr. Bausman, briefly exhibiting some of the life-traits of the departed brother. Hymn 120, by Rev. H. H. W. Hibshman, and the benediction by Rev. J. T. Foulk.

The church service was conducted in accordance with the solemnly simple usage of the Reformed church, by the Rev. N. Gehr and the Pastor. Thus were the beloved remains committed to their resting place, under the benediction of the Gospel, and in the blessed hope of the resurrection through Jesus Christ at the last day.

In the death of Dr. Schneck the church has lost one of its most worthy, devoted, and universally honored ministers; and a large number of friends throughout the entire church have been bereft of the personal fellowship of one whose presence among them for so many years was a source of pleasure and a tower of strength. But, whilst lamenting his sudden removal from among us, we should also give heed to those lessons of comfort and instruction which his long and useful life so richly supplies.

Those lessons may be most comprehensively and expressively summed up in the cheering declaration made by the imprisoned Apostle at the close of his earthly toils and conflicts in the service of the Lord: "*I have kept the faith*." (1 Tim. 4: 7.)

1. As seen in the sketch of our departed brother's career, given above, his life, in the deeper, inner sense, *started in a faith* grounded and built up on "*the faith*" of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He had learned that faith at his parents' knees, and had been trained up from his early youth to hold it as a faith clearly and definitely revealed in the Scriptures, and as being truly and distinctly set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism. That faith, as he embraced it, was not a mere summary of abstract doctrines. The church in which he was born, and by whose nurture he was trained, did not so hold or teach the faith. Rather it was, and was ever regarded, as the necessary exhibition and statement of the great facts and truths of redemption by Jesus Christ, as a personal Saviour, without some proper heart-knowledge of which no one can be saved. The mere "*form of sound words*," however intelligently apprehended or firmly held, has never been thought or taught to be *sufficient* to salvation. But, at the same time, it is ordinarily an essential means of salvation; and the cordial acceptance of that form, in its true and obvious sense is, ordinarily, a fixed condition of a saving apprehension of Him whom those words, by the Spirit, reveals to the soul, and unto whom, as the only "Christ, the Son of the living God," they



point and lead. And none but theorists, who may themselves be groping in the midst of error, or who may desire to entangle others in the meshes of their confused philosophy, will ever be found to disparage such a formal faith, or to endeavor to shake the confidence of believers in it. They well know that this is the surest way of success for their speculative schemes.

Resting on that true foundation, "the faith once delivered to the saints," the mind and heart of our Brother could, as it did, prevail against all the difficulties which in early life seemed to bar his way to the work and office which his love to the Saviour and His cause strongly prompted him to seek, and overcome all the temptations to choose a worldly pursuit which promised rich temporal rewards. He *knew* not only "whom he believed," but also *what* he believed, and was "fully persuaded in his mind," of its undoubted and indubitable truth. This led him into the ministry, and furnishes the first comforting and instructive lesson of his life.

2. The same clear and believing apprehension of "the faith" which thus constrained him to devote himself to the ministry of the Gospel, cheered and sustained him under the burden of the great work which was at once imposed upon him. Like Timothy, he was but a youth yet when the harness was buckled on him. And although the "unfeigned faith which was in him" was discerned by older servants of the Lord, so that they deemed him fitted for the office to which they set him solemnly apart soon after he had passed his twentieth year, those who learned subsequently to know him, can readily imagine that one so naturally timid, so lacking in self-confidence, and so prone to underrate himself, especially in view of the limited educational opportunities he had enjoyed, would engage in his labors with "fear and much trembling." But whatever misgivings he had of himself, he had none regarding "the Gospel committed" to him. In this respect "he was strong in faith." "His heart was fixed." By this he was mightily supported and securely guided in all his ministrations. When he preached, he did so *not* ambiguously, hesitatingly, or confusedly, as though doubting or uncertain himself as to the doctrine proclaimed, but he spoke as "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." From the Scriptures, and by deep personal experience, he had learned "the whole counsel of God;" and as he had clearly learned the doctrines of the Gospel, he could clearly and confidently proclaim them. He preached what he fully believed, and fully believed what he preached; and this assured confidence in the divine truth of what he preached, rested not in the wisdom or testimony of man, but in the power, authority and testimony of God. Men might err, traditions might mislead even as they are varying and unstable, the formal visible church though speaking by its chief councils and Synods might waver and lead astray, but the Word of God is sure and abiding truth. Happy the Christian, and thrice happy the Christian minister, whose feet are fixed on this foundation of faith, and whose head and heart are kept clear and steadfast in the apprehension and love of the great doctrine it reveals. No wonder that inspired and strengthened by it, even the young man of twenty could feel emboldened to assume the duties of so large a field as that to which our brother was called immediately upon entering the ministry. Fortunately for him, he began his official course at a time when

unanimity prevailed in our church regarding the faith. No specious or doubtful theological speculations had been intruded there yet to disturb her peace. No strange leaven insidiously brought in had begun to ferment at central points of educational influence and power. Upon all the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, the church was of one mind and heart, agreeing not in a dead orthodoxy, but in the living truth as it is in Jesus. This great advantage, therefore, our brother enjoyed, and it must have helped to fortify him for his work. How great the advantage was, and how largely it must have aided him in the discharge of his duties, can be best testified by the many who may have gone forth of late years with their reason confused and their confidence shaken as to the old faith of the church, and yet without being ready or able to embrace "another gospel."

3. Here, also, we may find the secret and explanation of what may be called the popularity and success of Dr. Schneck as a preacher at large. His pulpit themes were always prompted by the pure Gospel faith, and his sermons were ever in full harmony with it. He preached not a bewildering and delusive gospel of baptismal regeneration, sacramental salvation or redemption by a seemingly mystical, but really materialistic and pantheising organic conjunction of the real substance of the Godhead with humanity in general, and with each baptized one in particular. He had not so learned Christ. The burden of his pulpit messages was the simpler, but more really profound, and only true Gospel of "Jesus Christ and Him crucified," and of the necessity of hearty personal repentance and faith in Him, as the fundamental condition of being saved by Him. He proclaimed not sacerdotal absolution as the chief means of obtaining a peaceful assurance of the pardon of sin and acceptance with God, but justification by faith, and the only sure testimony of the love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost. He knew and rejoiced in the ordinances of the Lord, and sincerely maintained them as means of grace within the sense and limits of their divine design and appointment. But he never sought to magnify himself through his office, by arrogating for it, or any of its functions or ministrations, a virtue or efficacy not warranted by the Word of God, and as dishonorable to Him and His ordinances by such unjustifiable additions to them, as every detraction from what really pertains to them can be. Governed in his preaching by these principles, and ever animated with zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, we can easily understand why the preaching of Dr. Schneck should have proven so generally acceptable.

4. As in his preaching, so also in all his other labors for the cause of Christ in the church, he clung to "the faith," and with a "faith working by love." During the many years of his editorial control over the periodicals of the church, the *Messenger* and *Kirchenzeitung*, those papers were uniformly ruled by one spirit, and were made to bear harmonious testimony to the doctrines of grace as set forth in the standards and maintained in the prevailing belief of the church. Those papers had been founded as a means of perpetuating that belief, and of confirming hearts in it. Zeal and love for it had prompted hundreds of liberal members to contribute thousands of dollars for the permanent establishment of the papers upon a sufficient pecuniary basis. Dr. Schneck himself had



been largely instrumental in securing this object for this explicitly avowed purpose, and he had accepted the editorial trust with a clear understanding of what it involved in this respect, and a cordial assent to all. And he proved true to the trust. He proved so true to it that he never, without protest, allowed the papers under his charge to be perverted into an agency for undermining or even indirectly assailing the foundations which those papers, as an unconscious ministry, were pledged to strengthen and defend; and he never allowed them to be openly and directly assailed. Under his administration it would have been impossible for any dissatisfied with the Heidelberg Catechism, or zealous for theological novelties at variance with its plain tenor and spirit, to make the *Messenger* an engine of assault upon the citadel of our church faith.

That at one time, during the later years of his connection with the *Messenger*, he was tried and tempted in this respect, is known to many familiar with our ecclesiastical "situation" in 1850-52. But the grace that enabled him "to keep the faith" to that time, sustained him then also, and nerved his heart to utter an alarm-cry in 1851, in his own kind and moderate, but unequivocal way, which will not soon be forgotten. The editorial occasioned great excitement, and brought down some of those bitter (though impotent) maledictions upon him, to which errorists in power are prone to resort. At the meeting of the Synod that year (Lancaster, October, 1851,) he was taken severely to task, as we have been told (we were not present ourselves) for what he had dared to do,\* and one member, (one of thousands who afterwards demonstrated the need of the very warning which had been uttered by apostatizing to Rome) either privately or publicly, suggested that Dr. Schneck be expelled from the Synod!

All this because he had so "kept the faith" as to feel constrained to stand up for it in the face of a strong and subtle combination against it! It had been well for the church had his alarm-cry been heeded. But too many were still blind and deaf, and, *in part*, at least, we ourselves also were of that number. Now, however, how many who then did not see and would not believe, look back over his course and are both comforted and admonished by his firm devotion to the faith.

5. And this devotion characterized him to the end. The last twelve or more years of his life were spent in comparative retirement. Two principal reasons may be assigned for this. First of all, his general health, which received a severe shock from a sun-stroke in the summer of 1862, did not allow of his assuming the labors of a full pastoral charge. So, being unwilling to abandon work entirely, he confined himself to the duties of the pastorate of the small German interest already named, and whatever other Christian service he could render. But another reason for this retirement, though probably connected with that one just named, was, doubtless, a constitutional aversion to that kind of controversy which the advocates of the Mercersburg theology innovations have made unavoidable. To this may possibly have been added desponding apprehensions that resistance to those innovations was vain, and that the evils must be allowed to run their course like a canker, and possibly to correct themselves. His sensitive nature, also, especially at his age, and with a shattered

---

\*If possible, we will republish the editorial in a future number of the *Monthly*.

nervous system, shrank from exposure to such rancorous vituperations as he saw hurled at others, and he kept aloof from the strife. Beyond these reasons, however, suggested by merely personal considerations, it will not be hard now to discern a special Providence in his having been restrained from public participation in a struggle in which he always felt a deep, hearty interest. He seems to have been thus held back until a time when his testimony might tell most effectually against the subversive errors by which the peace of the church has been so grievously disturbed, and by which her evangelical principles, and even life, have been put in such extreme jeopardy.

It must certainly be admitted as something remarkably significant in every view, that, after having so long remained silent, he should have felt constrained by the almost simultaneous prompting of his own spirit and the solicitation of a friend, to prepare and publish his book against *Mercersburg theology*. Although in occasional correspondence with him, we had not the least thought of his having such a work in mind; and, however desirous we might have felt that he would come out in some form in defense of what we knew were his convictions, yet knowing how heavily the failing health of his esteemed, afflicted wife, must be weighing upon him, it never occurred to us to hope that he might possibly be induced to undertake a work which would be sure to excite the anger of those who appear to be far more jealous for their own theological reputation, and the success of their party schemes, than for the evangelical integrity of Christianity and the church.

From several notices of the work which have appeared in the MONTHLY, our readers are familiar with its aim and character. It need only be referred to now as furnishing the most cheering and impressive, because the fullest and last proof of his entire and unchanged loyalty of heart to *the faith* he had held and preached for fifty years. He had read, and he was capable of understanding all that is intelligible in the scheme of speculations known, commonly, as *Mercersburg theology*. The present editor of the *Messenger*, indeed, indulges in an insinuation intended to be disparaging to Dr. Schneck's theological ability. To this unjust and ungenerous insinuation we have nothing to say, excepting that it reflects more unfavorably upon its source, than upon the beloved and honored dead, whose reputation it seeks to blight. How well he understood the nature and bearing of the errors exposed, is fully demonstrated by his book. Indeed, the work undertaken is felt to be so well done, even by those whose false theology it sets in contrast with the doctrines of the Reformed church, that to this day they have been afraid to name the book in the *Messenger*, or explicitly to say that a book of the sort has been published, lest, perchance, it might be sought after and read. Such conduct clearly betrays the motives and spirit which prompt it.

How greatly this last service of our departed brother has been appreciated by the church, is shown by the large demand for it, and the rapidity with which the greater part of the first large edition of it has been sold. That some are aggrieved, and worse than aggrieved by its publication, we knew before the *Messenger* informed us of the fact. And Dr. Schneck was privately made to know it, too, in a form and manner which it would be a shame to publish, and



which, one might think, would now be remembered with feelings more bitter than shame. But for one who may thus feel selfishly aggrieved by that book, there are hundreds who most heartily thank him for this legacy of a calm, earnest, and unequivocal testimony against bold and presumptuous errors, and in vindication of the standard fundamental doctrines of our Reformed church.

As for himself, the beloved author was so far from regretting what he had done in obedience to his deep sense of duty, that he felt thankful for having been constrained and enabled to do it. Only two weeks before his departure, it was our privilege to spend a night in his house; and, whilst he deplored the malignant spirit betrayed by some letters he had received, he declared that his mind had not for years been so peaceful and calm, in regard to the state of the church, as since the publication of the book.

Here we must stop. Our beloved brother's personal work on earth is done. And it was well done, for "he kept the faith." Therefore, he "being dead, yet speaketh." Let us heed the great admonition of his life: "Hold that fast which thou hast; \* \* be faithful unto death." And as our faith and hope can see him welcomed into the joys of the Lord, let us resolve more earnestly than ever, to be "followers of them who, through faith and patience, inherit the promises." "Blessed is that servant whom the Lord, when He cometh, will find *so doing*."

NEWS FROM OUR CHURCHES.—The recent *Easter season* was one of large ingatherings, being the season when most of our churches have confirmation. To give the entire list of these additions in detail, would require much more space than we have now at command. We must, then, limit our record to a few cases specially reported to us.

*Myerstown, Pa.*, Rev. G. Wolff, pastor. The Lord's Supper was celebrated on April 12, connecting services having begun on Wednesday previous. The occasion was one of great solemnity and profit. *Eighteen* were received by confirmation, and *five* by certificate. During the past thirteen years of Brother Wolff's pastorate, 464 members have been added to the congregation, and, what is still more cheering, the most of them continue steadfast to this day.

*Waynesboro', Pa.*, Trinity church, Rev. H. H. W. Hibshman, pastor. It was a privilege we greatly appreciated to be permitted once more to unite with this congregation of our former charge in an Easter communion, April 5. Notwithstanding questionable efforts made during the past two years, calculated to disturb its peace and prosperity, it was a source of sincere joy to find everything in a very encouraging state. Its real strength has rather been increased than weakened, and a measure of harmony now prevails which more than compensates for some numerical losses sustained. There was no perceptible diminution in the general attendance, and the communion was one of the largest in the history of the congregation. The Sunday-school is very flourishing, and pastor and people have great reason to feel encouraged. *Seven* were added by confirmation.

*Lancaster, Pa.*, St. Paul's church, Rev. J. B. Shumaker, pastor. Our informant says: "We had a very gracious season at our Easter communion. *Twenty* persons were added to the church—*fifteen* by confirmation (including

eight by baptism), *four* by certificate, and *one* on renewed profession. Our communion was the largest in the history of the congregation. The Sunday-school, under the efficient management of J. H. Pearsol, Esq., and assistants, is in a very flourishing condition, the attendance being larger than for years. We have great reason for gratitude and encouragement."

*Lebanon*, First church, Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D., pastor. The recent communion season was a very precious one, and largely attended, cheering the hearts of pastor and pupil. As the confirmations in this church usually take place in the Fall, none are reported in connection with the late communion.

*Huntingdon charge*, Rev. A. G. Dole, pastor. The Easter communion is reported to have been one of unusual interest. *Thirty-one* members were added, namely: in the Huntingdon congregation 26, and in McConnelstown 5. Pastor and people may well feel inspired with lively gratitude and fresh zeal.

*Philadelphia*. A brother reports: The Easter communion services held at *Heidelberg Reformed church*, corner of Nineteenth and Oxford streets, were both profitable and pleasant. Services were held every evening during Passion week, except Saturday evening. Preparatory services and baptism on Good Friday evening, at which time ten adults and five children were baptized. Confirmation on Easter Sabbath morning, at which time eighteen were confirmed, eight added by renewed confession of faith, and five were received by letter—in all, thirty-one, together with eleven at previous communion, making forty-two since we are in the new chapel. One hundred and twenty communed. Two weeks previous to Passion week we had prayer-meetings every afternoon from 4 to 5 o'clock. The interest in the meetings increased daily, many being constrained by the Spirit to say, pray for me. Some have confessed Christ openly before men, and taken upon themselves His discipleship; and many are thinking earnestly in the matter, and will before long come out as decidedly on the side of the Lord as those who have gone before them. This congregation, since locating in this place, has been most signally blessed, both temporally and spiritually; and, having built a chapel which is not surpassed in this city for comfortable seats and a pleasant room, we invite all to come and see for themselves, and with us to enjoy for a season, at least, that communion of saints which is so pleasant and encouraging to the Christian heart. We can well say that we have had a delightful time in passing through this precious season of grace, and have found great pleasure in complying with the command: "For as often as ye do this, ye do show forth the Lord's death until He come." S.

*First Church*, Race street, Rev. E. H. Nevin, pastor. A measure of new interest, amounting to a revival of the best sort, has been awakened in this congregation. We have not been furnished with a definite statement of recent additions, but the condition of the congregation appears to be highly encouraging.

PASTORAL CHANGE.—The Rev. Eli Keller, recently of Canal Winchester, Ohio, has reached his new field, *Zionsville charge*, Lehigh county, Pa. His post-office address is *Shimersville*, Lehigh county, Pa. His reception was a warm one on the part of the people of the charge, and he commences his labors with bright promises of a successful pastorate. In regard to the sinister use made by a perversion, in the so-called *Reformed Church Messenger*, of some



statements of his in a recent communication published in one of our German papers, Brother Keller quaintly remarks: "They must have been badly off for water on that mill, to turn my remarks in the way they did on their wheel." But such a mill, like that on *Parnell's Knob*, which Brother K. and some others of us well remember, high and dry, is glad to turn any streamlet within its reach out of course, to catch water for a turn or two.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.—The Rev. W. E. C. Wright has resigned his six years' pastorate of Plymouth church, Philadelphia, to accept the Chaplaincy and Professorship of Biblical Literature in the American German Academy about to be established in Europe.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has approved the course of his Dean at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York last autumn, and he has confirmed his approval by appointing him his representative at the next meeting of the Alliance.

MORE than \$79,000 has been subscribed in Boston towards the projected building of the Young Men's Christian Union. This enterprise is, for the most part, conducted by Unitarians, yet no sectarian test is required for membership.

AN English vicar publishes a card in the London *Times*, inviting a layman, Mr. Kinniard, to preach in his church on any Sunday he chooses, promising to defray half the expenses of any legal action ensuing—all this, too, with the consent of his wardens.

WITHIN the past seventeen years, Mr. Spurgeon, of London, has received 13,000 persons into his church. He has erected thirty-six chapels in the metropolis, and supplied them with ministers trained in a college he founded and manages.

THE Rev. Dr. David Elliott, Emeritus Professor in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Allegheny City, died in his eighty-seventh year. He was the last living Moderator of the original Presbyterian General Assembly before the division.

AFRICA.—The Scottish Episcopal church having consecrated a missionary bishop (Dr. Callaway) for Kaffraria, will soon consecrate one for Madagascar, the Rev. John Rundle Cornish, Vicar of St. John's, Traro, having been selected for that position.

FRANCE.—*New Churches*.—Two new national churches are constituted by the State, those of Roche-sur-Yon and Vessoul. There are popular movements towards Protestantism in various parts of France, actuated by varied motives, generally a mixture of the political and the religious, Protestantism being considered very widely as being as much connected with Republicanism as Catholicism is with Royalism. What we need are the men full of the Holy Ghost, to lead these populations to Jesus, whose kingdom is not of this world.

BURMAH.—During the last eleven years there have been distributed from the mission press of Rangoon 19,407,773 pages of the Scriptures, and 32,418,394 pages of tracts.

PERSIA.—Already (*The Friend of India* says), before the Shah has left or even reached England, the breath of the new order of things had begun to stir in Persia. Mr. Bruce, who has given himself to that country, and fed thousands of its people last year, during the famine, from his mission-house at Julfa, in the suburbs of Ispahan, writes full of hope. First of all, the wheat harvest is so good this year that prices have fallen to  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a pound for good bread, while last year 5d. was given for the same quantity of a compound of straw, earth, and bran. "The Shah's visit to Europe, the railroad, the very increased interest now shown by very many Persians in Ispahan in the study of the Christian Scriptures, and many other things, especially the great desire for religious liberty manifested by the numerous Mohammedan sects here, and the very enlightened policy (though, perhaps, not always accompanied by sufficient wisdom and caution) adopted by the present Grand Wuzer—all show that great changes must occur before long in this country." Mr. Bruce represents the followers of the Baab sect, many of whom were formerly executed by the chief Mujtabid, as growing in boldness. He is working at a Persian translation of the New Testament; and in his composition of a Bible history, he is helped by a very learned Soofy and a tolerably learned Moolah, both of whom abhor Mohammedanism. He has purchased the mission-house at Julfa, and waits for the Church Missionary Society to do its duty to Persia in this new era.

INDIA.—The correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette* gives the latest data as to the progress of the Protestant Episcopal Mission in Bengal. It appears from his letters that the total number of communicants in that province is 93,098 souls, of whom 70,000 were born and bred in India, and 50,000 are pure natives. The report of the Missionary Conference at Allahabad has just published the statistics for all India. Unfortunately, it deals only with the Protestant natives, who number 224,161. The most remarkable feature disclosed by the missionary statistics, is the rapid progress of proselytism during late years. Between 1861 and 1871 the number has more than doubled in Bengal, while the communicants have increased nearly three-fold. In Central India native communicants have multiplied by nearly 400 per cent.; in Oudh by 175 per cent.; in the northwestern provinces it is nearly doubled; in the Punjab and Bombay it has increased by 64 per cent.; and the total increase for all India is 61 per cent. The increase during the previous ten years, from 1851 to 1861, was only 53 per cent. The missionaries calculate that, assuming a uniform increase of 61 per cent. for each ten years, the number of native Protestants in India will amount in 1951 to 11,000,000, and in A. D. 2001, 130,000,000.

ITALY.—The Claudian Press holds on in its career of successful activity, adding numberless Christian tracts and books to its former large stock, and to its popular almanac, a new one specially adapted to soldiers; while pleasant news reaches us of the auspicious opening of evangelistic work at Ajaccio, in Corsica, by the Rev. Mr. P. Andrault, lately a missionary in Africa.

BOHEMIA.—The Secretary of the Evangelical Continental Society writes: "At Laun, on the 8th of December, there were once more above 150 persons present at the Protestant service. We shall certainly not remain long without tribula-



tion, but our help lies in Him who reserves victory for Himself, even the Lord Jesus. On the 8th of December we celebrated the Lord's Supper for the first time in Laun. It was a blessed hour. There were ten communicants. Three more persons have forsaken the Romish church. In Libochowitz, also, several are intending to leave the Romish church. The Lord's Supper will be celebrated for the first time in this town on the 26th of December. We have six communicants there."

A PROMINENT Episcopal minister of Washington, Rev. John Vaughan Lewis, has preached a sermon in favor of a union of the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal churches, and spoken favorably therein of the movements headed by Bishop Cummins.

THE Rev. Mr. Roberts, a clergyman of the Church of England, having been dismissed from his curacy for the supposed offense of taking a prominent part in the agricultural laborers' movement, Mr. Gladstone generously appointed him to the living of Brindsley, a much more desirable position than he had previously held.

THE English Presbyterian church is making up a sustentation fund, and the minimum stipend given now is \$450. It is hoped to attain to \$1000. The Irish Presbyterian church have raised their lowest stipend to \$500, and are also laboring hard to increase the amount.

THE Church of Holland, known under the name of the Jansenists' Church of Utrecht, quits its isolated position and joins the Old Catholic organization. It is composed of four or five thousand persons, and is governed by the Archbishop of Utrecht, and the bishops of Haarlem and Deventer.

AN official return of the number of Old Catholics in Germany has been made. In Baden the number reported is 10,000; in Bavaria, 15,000; in Prussia, 20,000. The total for the empire in May, 1873, was 50,000. There were at that date 92 organized societies. In the budget is an appropriation of 16,000 thalers for the support of Bishop Reinkens.

IN 1828 four Karen boys applied for admission into Mr. Boardman's Burman school, at Maulmain. He says in his journal that, as they huddled together, trying to hide their nakedness with a single strip of cloth between them, they made a curious picture. This was the beginning of the work among the Karens. Now there are 6000 Karen children in Baptist mission schools.

DR. JAMES STRONG, of Drew Seminary, arrived at Cairo, February 4th, with his party, all in good health and spirits. They went up the Nile on the 11th ult., and twenty days afterward undertook the Sinai and Desert route to Jerusalem. Rev. T. W. Chambers, of the Reformed church, with his companions, left Cairo in company with Dr. Strong.

AT Shinhing, eighty miles from Canton, there is a native church of about twenty baptized brethren and sisters, and several others, once members, have died in the Christian faith. The native children are taught to sing Christmas

hymns as soon as they can speak. The members of the church are a light to the surrounding darkness, and in their love for the Scriptures and zeal in spreading the tidings of salvation, they might well serve as examples to many in Christian lands.

As the result of the revival in St. Louis, more than a thousand persons have already been added to the various churches there, and the gathering of the fruit has only just begun. Better even than this, large accession to the churches is the strengthening of the ties of union between the churches and the pulling down of barriers between denominations which the revival has brought about. Old feuds and grudges have been buried, and the rising tide of Christian love has submerged the old landmarks of division. Mr. Hammond has closed his labors in St. Louis.

A NEW German Theological Seminary has been opened at Bloomfield, N. J. for educating young Germans for the ministry, under the care of the Presbyterian church. Rev. Chas. A. Knox, late pastor of the church at Bloomfield, has been elected its President, and Dr. George Seibert, Professor of Biblical Exegesis and Theology. The Seminary has 24 students, many of them sons of widows of German ministers. Five have been licensed to preach the gospel in neighboring vacant churches. The Seminary is in a large and commodious building, bought for \$19,000, to which sum the people of Bloomfield contributed \$6,000. The students live on what they get from the Board of Directors. No professorship is endowed, and at present there is but a small fund of about \$12,000.

IN Sweden it has been hitherto almost impossible to get out of the Established Church (Lutheran) into any of the Dissenting churches, and the members of these churches have been subjected to certain legal disabilities of a very tormenting character. A law has recently been passed by which, upon the expression of a desire to join another communion on the part of any person over 18 years of age, the pastor of his parish is obliged to register the transfer. This reform will, it is said, lead speedily to the removal of the other legal embarrassments in marriage and baptism under which the Dissenters are now laboring.

THE London Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is the oldest English missionary society. While the conversion of the heathen is one of its objects, its more direct work is the extension of the Church of England in its colonies. Its revenue last year amounted to more than \$500,000. It supports wholly, or in part, 463 ordained missionaries, of which number 223 labor in the West Indies, 84 in Africa, 114 in Asia, 45 in Australia and the Pacific Islands, and 1 in Europe; 35 are native clergymen in India. As a result of the Day of intercession, appointed by the Society, the means and the men were furnished for two new missions, one in China and one in Japan.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—JUNE, 1874.—No. 6.

---

BORN OF THE SPIRIT.

THE observance of another Pentecost calls for renewed special consideration of the various works more immediately ascribed to the Holy Ghost, the third person of the adorable Trinity. Of those works, that named above is the *first* in the personal application of redemption to man. In order that the sinner may be saved by Christ, he must be *born again*, or *regenerated*, in common theological language. This is declared to be effected by the Holy Spirit. And the effect when wrought is sometimes called, in view of the manner and means by which it is wrought, a *baptism by the Holy Ghost*, in distinction from a mere formal water baptism, employed by divine appointment as a sign and seal of the reality of the other baptism, and for the confirmation of the penitent believing sinner's faith in the efficacy of what has been effected by the grace of the Spirit.

*The Necessity of Regeneration,*

Has ever been admitted by all evangelical Christians. Whatever sense may have been attached to the term, all have agreed that it expressed some great change which every one must undergo in becoming a true child of God, qualified for a place in the kingdom of heaven, and for enjoying the blessings of that kingdom. The Scriptures teach this so plainly, and insist upon it so strongly, as an indispensable condition of salvation, that they leave no room for difference of opinion on this point. Reason and experience

also unite in confirming what the Scriptures thus teach. They testify to every one's mind and heart, that man by nature is so corrupt, so inclined to evil, and averse to what is right and good, that his inmost being needs thorough renewing.

But whilst the necessity of such a regenerating work is generally admitted, there is a serious difference of view in regard to

*The Nature of It.*

Some maintain that it involves nothing more than what may be called a merely *moral* change, using the term moral in the usual popular sense. By this they mean that it is simply a voluntary turning of the mind from error to truth, and of the affections from sin to righteousness! Of course they hold that the work in this view must be most sincere and thorough, producing manifest spiritual effects of the happiest kind in the inner and outer life of the subjects of the change. They also insist upon the efficacious agency of the Holy Spirit in the entire process, without whose gracious help the change would and could not take place. But still they view it as only moral, and as wrought by *merely* moral means, like those used by some benevolent person to persuade a drunkard to become a temperate man, or a thief to abandon his vicious habits.

On the *opposite extreme* we have those who hold that regeneration consists, mainly and fundamentally, in a literal and total new creation of the person born again, in the sense of conveying to him some new *substance*, possessing a vitalizing or quickening power, as in the case of natural conception or birth. According to this notion, men are "born of the Spirit," because it is by the operation of the Spirit, as is affirmed, that such a quickening substance is conveyed from the life-substance of the God-head over to man. This substance, then, is, as they contend, the divine germ or seed (semen) out of which the new man develops and grows. As any one can see, this view makes a pantheistic doctrine out of the whole thing. For if the very substance or essence of God is conveyed over to man in regeneration, and the new creature in Christ Jesus grows up out of that substance, it is evident that the very nature or essence of God is thus fused and transfused into and among those said to be so born of the Spirit. This, virtually, is the doctrine taught in the *Mercersburg Review*, and defended by the Lancaster school. In seeming support of this



erroneous and very hurtful notion, those who advocate it are in the habit of appealing to what St. Paul quotes in his address at Athens about men being God's "offspring," and St. Peter's declaration, "partakers of the divine nature." Of course they misapprehended and misinterpret all such passages.

*The true view*, according to the Scriptures and general faith of evangelical Christians, avoids both the above errors, and especially rejects the second one. It denies entirely that any new *substance* is implanted in man by regeneration, but most emphatically that any part of the essence or substance of God is thus put into him.\* On the other hand it affirms, that to be "born of the Spirit," involves more than a merely moral change. It teaches and maintains that there is a thorough renewal or renovation of the inmost life and being of man's spiritual nature, or, as the Bible declares, a renewal "of the spirit and tenor of the mind," a turning of "the heart of stone into a heart of flesh," or, as the Heidelberg Catechism expresses it, "a mortification of the old man, and a quickening of the new man." Hence, as the same Catechism says in another place, the regenerated are "*not natural sons of God*," which they would be if the Lancaster notion, as set forth in the *Mercersburg Review* were correct, but "*adopted sons*." It is *sin* which makes a regeneration necessary. But the deepest seat of sin is not in any material substance (however subtly conceived) of man's being; its inmost lodgment is in the immaterial spirit, will, affections, reason, of man. Hence it is there primarily that regeneration must begin. There were sects, anciently, which held (like the old Persians and Indians) that the seat of sin was in the material substance of man, but they were always regarded as dangerous heretics.

#### *Of the Spirit.*

Now this true regeneration is called a being "*born of the Spirit*" because it can be effected.

1. *Not* by man or merely human agencies of any sort. It cannot be effected by *natural*, physical powers or influences, as "by blood or the will of the flesh." It cannot be effected by *magical* sacerdotal instrumentalities, such as may be used by "the will of

---

\* See an item in *Editor's Desk* regarding an attempt made by one of the Lancaster Professors to prop up their false, pantheizing view of this point, by citations from Ebrard.

man," when and where he pleases. It cannot be effected by any human *moral* agencies, that is by any strong purpose or resolution which man may be led to form, in his own imagined moral might.

2. But it must be wrought by God, by a divine power of grace made to bear effectually upon the spirit of man, and making man "willing in the day of His power" to be so renewed, or regenerated. And the exercise of this power is ascribed to the Holy Ghost, because what is to be done is emphatically a spiritual work, and the effects to be procured are primarily and emphatically spiritual effects. Hence, in view also of the greatness of the change to be wrought, the almighty, quickening power of God, the Spirit accomplishes it.

In full accordance with this we find also, that

*The means employed*

are truly and significantly spiritual in their character. The first and chief instrument or means used is *the Gospel*, made known to men in order to enlighten and convince them, to make them feel their misery as sinners, their need of a divine Saviour, and to bring them to hearty repentance, and to faith in Jesus Christ. The Gospel, as used by the Spirit for this purpose, of course includes the Law, made in this way a "schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." On this account the Gospel is called "the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth." For the same reason it is declared that the truly regenerate are "born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God*, which liveth and abideth forever."

The more fully to declare, or make known, and seal to us, this blessing, or to confirm our hearts in it, God has ordained the holy sacrament of baptism. But regeneration is not effected by baptism, or always inseparably connected with its administration (as for instance Dr. Gerhart says it is, in his Tract number 3), although it may take place at the time a person is baptized. As already stated, the chief instrument is the Gospel, made effectual to this end by the Spirit. Hence, as we find it asserted in the Palatinate Catechism, translated by Dr. Good and by Dr. Harbaugh before Mercersburg theology began its development, "washing in baptism is a representation of the washing away of sins," just as "circumcision is a representation of the removal of sin."



*Inferences.*

1. How much we owe to the grace of the Holy Spirit, and how thankfully we should always keep this in mind.
2. How carefully and closely we should cling to the true Scriptural doctrine on this important subject.
3. How wrong it is for men to allow themselves to be confused and misled in regard to this doctrine by any vain speculations of their own mind, or love of theological novelties.
4. How diligently should Christians guard against being led astray by such vain speculations, no matter how profound and learned those who teach them may pretend to be, or may seem to be. "Stand fast in the faith."

---

THE LITURGICAL QUESTION.

(*Continued.*)

BUT has the Synod, after all, fully understood its own action, in the sense now explained; and is the church prepared really to unite in adopting the present Liturgy, after any revision to which it may be subjected in this conservative way? It is not for us here to answer the question, grave as it is for the work with which we are charged; the answer must come finally from the church itself. So much, however, is certain: there has not been a common understanding among the different members of the Committee themselves, in regard to either the nature of the revision the Liturgy calls for, or the meaning of the synodical instructions under which they are required to act. *When they came together, accordingly, and entered into an earnest interchange of views, it was found impossible for them to proceed at all with any sort of harmony and consent in their work, since it was apparent from the start, that their differences of opinion regarded not merely things of secondary account, but fundamental points affecting the very life and being of the Liturgy as it now stands.*

The body of the Committee are indeed of one mind. They believe that the Liturgy needs revision, and only regret that there

has been so little trial of it yet, in the way of actual practice, on which to base such revision with the best effect. They can see how in many things it is capable of being improved, and have themselves many alterations to suggest for this purpose. But they are not willing to give up the distinctive character of the Liturgy itself, or to admit changes that strike at its organic constitution. They are not willing to have it forced into the service of an order and manner of worship altogether different from its own. *They wish to have it still a sacramental liturgy; a liturgy not for the pulpit but for the altar; a liturgy ruled by the spirit of the church year; a liturgy that shall be the natural home of the creeds, and chants, and grand old collects, that have come down to us hallowed by the use of the church in past ages; a liturgy to be solemnly transacted by the people, along with the minister, in the courts of the Lord's house.*

There is, however, a minority view in the Committee—claiming, nevertheless, to be altogether the majority view of the church at large—which refuses to be satisfied with any such revision as this. It may not call for any larger amount of change than is thought of on the other side; but the change it calls for is of another quality and kind, for it goes to destroy in fact what it proposes to preserve. According to the view in question, the Liturgy should have no responses. This implies, of course, that it should be in the main a service-book for the minister only, whom the people then are expected to follow in passive silence. Objection is made again to its strong sacramental tone at certain points; and a disposition is shown altogether to have it less after the altar pattern of the ancient church, and more after the pulpit fashion of latter times. The genius of the Reformed church, we are told, has always been in favor of a free and plain worship, and we ought not now to think of varying our liturgical practice materially from this rule. Such, we are to assume, has been the view of the church all along. In ordering the new Liturgy to be formed, as much as possible, on the general basis of the liturgical worship of the primitive church, the Synod meant only that so much regard should be had to this as might comport with the general practice of the Reformed church in the 16th century. And what the church now calls for, it is said, is such a revision of the work as may clear it of what is found not to agree with this rule. It has been weighed in its present form and found wanting. Our con-



gregations generally have refused to go into the use of it; yet they like it on the whole, we hear, and would be glad to accept it, if only it were relieved from its "objectionable peculiarities;" and now to meet the exigency, the Synod, following the multifarious voice of the classes, has put it once more into the hands of the original Committee, for the express purpose of having it brought into such improved shape. No very broad alterations are supposed to be necessary for this purpose; the material of the Liturgy may remain much what it is now; only, the governing tone of it should be changed, and the parts ordered in such way, that it may not seem to be so much a ritual in the old church sense, as a mere directory rather for public worship in the sense of modern times.

In these circumstances, the Committee have felt that they could not proceed in their appointed work with any hope of success. *How could they expect to agree in regard to particulars and details, where there was such difference in regard to first principles and general laws?* It was in the power of the majority, it is true, to out-vote the minority, and so carry things their own way. But they had no heart to go forward in that manner; knowing well that such divided action in the Committee was sure to be followed by a division of sentiment also in the church, and that *it must ever be worse than folly to think of carrying any measure of this sort with a religious denomination like ours, without its own most general if not entirely universal consent.* There could be no freedom, no spirit, no confidence or hope, with the work of revision carried forward in any such blind and uncertain way. It would be like going to sea without either compass, or rudder, or nautical chart. We have found ourselves, therefore, brought to a stand, as not knowing in what direction or manner to move. It seemed necessary, first of all, that there should be a fair and full understanding of what we were really expected to do in the business committed to our hands; and this required, of course, that we should bring the whole subject before the church again, for the purpose of ascertaining its mind with regard to it beyond any possibility of mistake. No previous instructions for this purpose are enough; for it is made a question now how these themselves should be construed or understood; and whether they represent truly, after all, in what they seem to say, the reigning judgment of the church at the present time.

time. The Baltimore propositions appear to be very plain and explicit in setting forth the principles on which the new liturgy was to be formed ; but it is maintained that the Synod did not mean at the time by any means as much as their language is now made to mean ; that they did not see fully the bearing of their own action ; and that now, at all events we have the sense of the church revealed very differently, in the general demand which has been made for having the Liturgy revised and changed. It is not necessary to discuss these points. Whether the past action of the church has been misunderstood, or whether we are to suppose that the church, on more mature consideration, has changed its own mind, comes, for our present purpose and view, to the same thing in the end. What we have to do with, is the actual mind of the church at this time, however brought to pass. By that, this whole liturgical work must stand or fall. The Committee, then, in their great embarrassment, that they may not seem to run and labor in vain, find it necessary to call for new direction and instruction, more definite and full than any they have yet received, and such as may be sufficient to show, without room for question or doubt, what the actual views and wishes of the church, at the present time, in regard to a liturgy are ; and for this purpose they come now before the Synod with the present report or memorial, carefully prepared, on the whole subject, which it is hoped may serve to bring its necessities and difficulties fairly into view, and thus open the way at least for such conclusive action in regard to them, as the greatness of the interest is felt now on all sides to require.

Let it be decided, then, first of all, what order of liturgy the German Reformed church in this country is supposed to need, as best suited to her present theological and historical position. This is a question which goes here necessarily before all other questions, and which we have no right to pass in our circumstances, without a full and clear answer. Of the two conceptions of liturgical worship which have been explained, is it the first or the second that we are expected to be governed by, as a church, in our present liturgical movement? Do we want a mere mechanical or an organic liturgy ; a book of forms for the minister simply, or a scheme of devotional service for the whole congregation ; a liturgy in the spirit of the pulpit only, or a sacramental liturgy breathing throughout the spirit of the altar ?



Do we wish, it may be asked again, to keep ourselves absolutely to the rule of such systems of worship as have prevailed heretofore in the Reformed church, whether in Europe or in this country; or are we prepared still—in what seems to be the spirit of those Baltimore instructions of 1852—to exercise a wider freedom, by throwing ourselves back on the “general basis” of the Christian worship of the first ages, and thus aiming at a reconstruction of the Reformed worship, in which the ancient faith and the modern faith may be fitly exhibited in the power of a common life, answerable to the true genius of our church at the present time? *We have no desire to disguise the fact, that this is, under a different form, substantially the same question as before. The Reformed Confession, from the beginning, if we except the Episcopal portion of it in England, for reasons which it is not now necessary to consider, has not been favorable to much outward form or ritual action in worship; and its liturgical productions, accordingly, have been all along more mechanical than organic, more in sympathy with the pulpit than with the altar. If these formularies then, with their reigning tendency, down to our own “Mayer Liturgy” of 1840, are to bound and circumscribe our liturgical movement at the present time, so that it shall not be allowed to go beyond them, or out of their sphere, in any way, this must of itself amount to a practical settling for us of the question, what order of liturgy we propose to have. Let this be well considered, then, in connection with what was asked before; and in full view of the entire subject, let the Synod now, in the name of the church, make known its whole mind and will in regard to it, in such way that there shall be no room farther for any confusion or mistake. Must the past liturgical practice of the church, so far as there has been any such practice, control our universal worship now? Must our new Liturgy be of one kind in manner and form, in genius and spirit, with the reformed Liturgies of the sixteenth century, having these only for its basis, and following them as its rule? If such be, indeed, the general view and feeling of the church, as it is assumed to be in much that is said about the Provisional Liturgy as it now stands, let it be at once known to ourselves and openly declared to the world. This would of itself settle much for the work with which we are engaged. We shall know then where we are, and what we are doing.*

In that case, it is plain enough that the Provisional Liturgy, in

its present form, is not what the church wants, or is at all prepared to accept. *For, as we have said before, it requires no argument to show that it is not after the pattern strictly of any system of worship which has prevailed hitherto in the German Reformed church either in this country or in Europe. It makes no such profession or pretence.* It aims to be an improvement upon this whole past cultus, by which it is to be made more thoroughly liturgical than ever before. All this it bears upon its face without any sort of concealment or disguise. If, then, we want no such *innovation upon our old system*, if our liturgical feeling, such as it is, can be still satisfied with that general type of worship, and has not become with us a want looking above it or beyond it in any way, it is most certain, without any farther question, that the new Liturgy, as it now stands, is not at all what we need or should be willing to receive. So much the issue before us really and truly involves. Let us be fully awake then to its whole meaning and sense. *It is a question of very material change in our church practice, if not in our church life. The new Liturgy is for us, as a church, in many respects, a new scheme of worship. It is not the pattern according to which our fathers worshiped, either in these United States or elsewhere.* If that be for us, the "pattern in the mount," from which we have have no mind to make any change, let us say at once, "We want no worship in this new form. The Liturgy may be good in its own order and kind; but it is not such a liturgy as suits the German Reformed church; we will not have it, therefore, for our use."

(To be continued.)

---

#### OUR CREED!

WHAT may an honest minister or professor in theology in the Reformed church teach as its doctrine? What liberty is permitted him in this matter of duty? No one questions that he is free to teach the doctrines of the articles of the so-called apostles' creed. But how shall he interpret these articles? Is he permitted to evolve a meaning out of his own consciousness, or may he retrace the pathway of the church to the third or fourth centuries,



to the teaching of Cyprian and his cotemporaries? This were proper to him, had not the interpretation of the creed been substantially fixed for him as a teacher in the Reformed church. He is suffered only to transmit to his auditors or pupils that exposition of its words which is given in the Heidelberg Catechism, or at least what is in essential harmony with that exposition. To this commentary he must adhere strictly and conscientiously. There is no way to evade this, for the Catechism is the doctrinal standard—the confession accepted and avowed by the Reformed church. This Catechism that limits and defines the meaning of the articles of the creed in its literal and specific statements of doctrine, every minister and teacher of theology obliges himself by solemn covenant to adhere to in all his instructions, public or private. The meaning of the creed as accepted by the Reformed church, is *fully* and *clearly* set forth in the Catechism, and no one while he adheres to that church is allowed to introduce novelties in the meaning of the creed, as for him it can mean only what the Catechism declares. For him the creed has a fixed, a well-defined meaning. He may bring all the stores of his learning, and all the adornment of his rhetoric to its elucidation and proof, but he may not deface, modify or change it. He may embellish it with all his skill, but it must remain *the* creed as understood and interpreted in the Heidelberg Catechism.

The question now, however, returns with all its force. How shall the Catechism be interpreted? What meaning shall be given to its words? That, and only that, which it had for those who prepared it, and with the meaning which those attached to it who accepted it as the measure of their faith. It can have but one meaning, and it yields to no change in time, forms of thought or diversity of belief. Its true *historic* meaning is the only one it can have for a Reformed minister or teacher. In the Reformed churches that have adopted it as their exposition of faith, it means to-day just what it did for the faith of those who first received it as the full and proper expression of revealed divine truth. He who teaches in the Reformed church is required to learn and know what was the exact truth it conveyed to the fathers of the sixteenth century, and then find the interpretation which he must give, its questions and answers, and transmit it unimpaired and unadulterated as the true Reformed doctrine. The vaunted spirit of progress and theological *science* may sneer at this, and

grow restive under the cord that binds them to such antiquated formulas, but it cannot be helped in the Reformed church, with its "absolute and final" form of truth. This does not hinder the employment of every scholarly attainment in the explanation of our Reformed symbol—the richest stores of theological learning may be exhausted in defending and proving its propositions. Every scientific acquisition that modern researches has furnished, may be well and wisely used to declare the harmony that holds between its foundation truths and reason and nature, but no member of the Reformed church dare depart from its doctrinal statements or assail its agreement with the revealed word of God. Common honesty dictates this view. A proper sense of the fealty due to the church, at whose altars one ministers, demands that he shall hold to the term of his covenant with that church, and accept and teach her creed as the church itself has understood and still understands it. This does not declare that such creed in every or any point meets the demand of the science or learning of the age. It does not even maintain that it is a correct interpretation of the word of God. It only declares, that it being the creed of the Reformed church, it must be inviolable by its members until changed by the proper authority. If any minister or teacher in the Reformed church outgrows the theology of the church as set forth and adopted soon after the reformation in the words of the Catechism of Heidelberg; if his deeper divine insight, or his science and learning, have enabled him to discover error or falsehood in this Reformed creed, he has but to say so and renounce his allegiance to, and depart from it. In his position—under his vows—he can do no less; for it were arrant treachery to a confiding church to teach in her pulpits and halls other doctrine than that by *it* held to be sound and true.

But why such explicit statement of this evident and commonly accepted truth about confessional fealty? Good, honest men, are agreed about it. Only for this, because recently there have been noticed in the "*Mittelmass*" *Messenger* some hints and "criticisms" that appeared to contravene this truth. Because the boasting is everywhere to be read and heard, that Mercersburg theology is something *new* in the life of the Reformed church. That it is an advance on our fathers of the Reformation, or even of the church fathers in this country. Because the order of worship has doctrinal statements that *cannot* be made to square with the accepted



historical teaching of the Catechism. Here is a sentence from one of the Professors at Lancaster, embalmed in nitre, in the *Messenger's* columns of theology and criticism: "But that their (the Protestant) theological confessions are not fixed, we take to be an advantage. Each Protestant church has such a confession, which is for it a certain measure or rule. But not one of them can claim, ought to claim, that its confession is absolute and final."

Were all this accepted as true, and that Bossuet's "Variations of Protestantism" was truthful, and that God had allowed the Protestant church for the three hundred and more years since the Reformation to get on in some slipshod, uncertain way, without any "absolute or final truth" in its confessions, yet it would not follow as a consequence that a few Professors at Lancaster, who believe the Heidelberg Catechism thus defective, have *the right*, or that it is *proper* for them to set aside, change its statements of doctrines, and undermine and unsettle the faith of the churches. It is just here where the wrong comes in, that a few conceited men should constitute themselves *the* Reformed church, and because the Catechism and her ancient liturgies, hallowed to the life and faith of the church by a use and belief of three hundred years, do not in their inflexibility adapt themselves to their hermaphrodite theological, philosophical and scientific system, they must be swept away by something new, or so "*eviscerated*" of their true meaning as to become a dead carcass. Who gave these men the right to substitute for the *historic* meaning of the Heidelberg Catechism the vagaries of Liebnitz, Pusey, Schleiermacher, Fritschel, etc., and so teach the churches and the rising ministry? To most Christian men it would seem a terrible crime to steal away the faith of a church, to arrogate the powers of the whole church. It is only *the whole* church that can amend, change, abrogate or adopt a confession. and until this is done, the Heidelberg Catechism is the confession of the belief of the Reformed church, and its teachings must mould and rule the teachings of the pulpit and the seminary. It is, indeed, most unwarrantable that a few irresponsible men should obtrude their hallucinations and resurrected conceits and errors upon the church. It is even demanded for these utterances that they are *the* doctrines of the Reformed church, with sublime effrontery. Yet while thus presumptuous, they have never had Christian courage to submit this, "another

Gospel," as enunciated in "an order of worship," to the judgment of the church. To-day it is in use and before the churches in violation of the fundamental law of the church.

While to those who love the order and worship of their fathers' church, it seems a great crime to destroy the foundations and sap the faith of a church, yet it is not anything new. It was done in the pulpits and schools of Germany and Switzerland by men engaged to teach the doctrine of Scriptural confessions; this was also the case in New England and Old England, when her churches were impregnated with Unitarian doctrine by men who had vowed to teach the stern Calvinism of the Westminster Confession. To-day we see the same thing in the Church of England and the Episcopal church of this country, where Romish doctrines and practices are taught by men who, as Protestants, were entrusted with the defence of the articles of these churches as sound and true, while possibly they had in their pockets a dispensation from the Pope permitting and absolving the treachery. No one need, then, to express surprise. That which is taking place in our Reformed church is no strange thing, as the records of the past will show. It is not an isolated case of wrong; for other churches, too, are thus tried and afflicted. It may not be a matter of surprise if our educational institutions and our churches are "sold out," not "to the Dutch," but to scientific Atheism, Puseyism, or Rome, after the defiant utterances of the report on "the Liturgical Question," by the sapping and mining attacks of the *Messenger*, and by the open departure of an advance guard to Rome. We remember to have seen from one of the Professors at Lancaster a comparison between G. D. Wolff, that Professor's whilom friend and fellow helper, and Benedict Arnold, the American traitor, par excellence. If the comparison was just, who was it inoculated his nature with the venom of treason? He has told the world that it was done by the Professors in a Protestant College and Seminary at Mercersburg. But in what respect does G. D. Wolff surpass in his wrong those who made him what he is, who remain in the Reformed church and still teach the doctrine which made him the traitor they call him. In a candid judgment, not ruled by personal likes or dislikes, we hold that this "traitor" so far commends himself to honest men, that he has gone to Rome where his heart was, and has ceased to defraud the Reformed church. He has ceased in a nominally Protestant pulpit to teach



*Reply to Dr. Gerhart's Card in Messenger.* 299

Romish error. He renounced a creed whose doctrine he did not teach. He no longer persists to foist a creed on the Reformed church that she abhors, nor does he longer undermine her foundation while pretending to minister at her altars. So far his conduct is better than that of those who revile him. That doctrines are taught in the Reformed church by men whose vows bind them to teach the doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism that are not in consonance with their historic sense, it needs only an examination to learn. Let any one place side by side with the utterances of the catechism those of the Mercersburg theologians, and it will be plain how diverse they are, and that only a forced and unhistoric meaning put on the catechism can make them agree. We hope some one will take upon him the labor who can give the time to collect these utterance, on all the several points comprised in the answers of the catechism, and then place the questions and answers as found in the catechism in one column, and opposite in another column the same question with the answer as found in the writing of the Mercersburg school. On baptism, Gerhart & Rupp would furnish the answers. On the Lord's Supper, the order of worship, etc. On Christ's death, Dr. Apple, in the Messenger; and so on to the end.

The writer of this article would perform this work, did he have in possession or reach all the documents needed. It would require a file of the *Mittelmass Paper*—a complete set of the *Mercersburg Review*, etc., etc. He has not these, nor time at his disposal. It is a work that should be done. It is needful to show the departure from the historic meaning of the catechism. Let some son of our dear old church render her this service and expose the crafty devices of the enemies that nestle in her bosom.

ULRIC.

---

A REPLY TO DR. GERHART'S CARD IN THE MESSENGER OF MAY 6, 1874.

In this card Dr. Gerhart charges, that a certain sentence given by Dr. Schneek (in his book on the Mercersburg Theology)

as a quotation from Dr. Gerhart's celebrated Tract No. 3, is a forgery; but he expressly exonerates Dr. Schneck from intentional wrong.

We do not believe that the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY has ever, intentionally or otherwise, misquoted or misrepresented Dr. Gerhart, or any of the Mercersburg writers. This would be wrong. Nor is there any necessity of so doing, as these writers have put forth more than enough of extreme views and opinions to deserve all the criticism they have received. Just so soon as they will cease teaching these anti-Reformed errors, there will be peace, but not sooner.

We have taken the pains to hunt up the sentence which Dr. Schneck says he transferred from the REFORMED MONTHLY, verbatim, and have found that the sentence is one of our own, *for which we are willing to be held fully responsible*, and which we are now ready to vindicate. But we did not give it as a quotation from Dr. Gerhart's Tract, and did not ascribe the *language* to him. The MONTHLY is free from all blame in the matter. We are unable to say how Dr. Schneck made the mistake, but we are quite sure (as Dr. Gerhart admits) that that good man, now gone to his rest, did not mean to do injustice.

Dr. Gerhart's remarkably obscure Tract on Baptism, (Tract No. 3) will be found in full in the MONTHLY for November, 1870. In the MONTHLY for January, 1871, the present writer undertook the venturesome task of reviewing said Tract, and of showing how completely and fully it was the "contradictory opposite" of the teachings of the Heidelberg Catechism. In the course of that article (p. 30), in the way of summing up, we said (giving here the paragraph in full): "Now in opposition to this (*i. e.*, the teachings of the Heidelberg Catechism) our author teaches that we receive 'all the benefits of Christ' (as detailed in the eight momenta above), not *by faith*, not through previous knowledge of our misery, not in the way of *repentance and faith*, but through *baptism*, and through baptism *exclusively*. 'It needs no repentance in order to become a child of God.' 'Do not tell them that they *must repent of sin* and obey God, in order that God may love them.' 'There is no way in which a man can be created anew by the Spirit, according to the established economy of salvation, *but by baptism*.' "

Dr. Gerhart now makes a great ado about this sentence having



been given as a quotation from him (which is all well enough), but the vital question still remains, and this after all is the main point—*Whether Tract No. 3 (or Dr. Gerhart) did not, by a perfectly fair interpretation, teach what that sentence ascribes to him?* This question we propose now to answer. We ask the impartial reader either to read Tract No. 3 itself, or else carefully to consider the following extracts, which Dr. Gerhart will not deny to be genuine extracts from his own production :

1. "We baptize in the name of the Father. This means *that in the act of Baptism God creates a child of Adam*, fallen under the power of the Devil, *anew in Christ* by the Spirit *in His image and after His likeness*. The subject of baptism is now a child of God; and God is no longer only Creator, but also really Father." There is not one word said in connection with this, that *faith* is necessary and *repentance* is necessary in order to appropriate the merits of Christ, as Dr. Gerhart *now* affirms. On the contrary, he expressly says afterward of the child: "It needs no repentance in order to become the child of God." "Do not tell them that they must repent of sin and obey God, in order that God may love them; but tell them that God has loved them in Christ, and loves them now, though they are sinners." Still more express is the next quotation :

2. "We baptize in the name of the Son. This means, that *in creating a sinner anew in Christ*, God *delivers him by baptism* from the bondage of the Devil, and *from the curse of a broken law*; *cleanses him from the pollution of sin*, and *engrafts him* by the Spirit into Christ. The person baptized is thus no longer only a member of the fallen race of mankind, and a partaker of all the consequences of the sin of Adam, but also a member of Christ, *a partaker of the life of Christ and of all the benefits of His redeeming work*." Now, how did he become "a partaker of all the benefits of Christ?" "By baptism," Dr. Gerhart affirms in Tract No. 3. No; "by the exercise of personal faith *exclusively*," answers the same logical Dr. Gerhart, in the *Messenger* of May 6th. To which Dr. Gerhart shall we listen? Is it not true that the sentence complained of, *and now repudiated*, was a true summing up of the teachings of Dr. Gerhart?

3. "In holy baptism grace is this same divine life of Christ given by the new creating power of the Holy Spirit to those who are by nature dead in sin, *in that by baptism they are engrafted into*

*Jesus Christ, and are thereby made partakers of Christ and all His benefits.*" Here again we have it affirmed, as expressly as words can make it, that men are made partakers of Christ and all His benefits by baptism. Now this proposition of Dr. Gerhart is the "contradictory opposite" of what he *now* affirms as his true sentiments in the *Messenger*, just as it is the "contradictory opposite" of the Heidelberg Catechism (Q. 20), which affirms (taking Dr. Gerhart's own translation) that "only such are saved *as by a true faith are engrafted into Him, and receive all His benefits.*" We hope that Dr. Gerhart's card will have the effect of drawing new attention to the teachings of his Tract, and to the remarkably contradictory character of the far-famed Mercersburg theology. If it does he will have only himself to blame in the case.

We might make more quotations to the same effect, but it is not necessary. That Dr. Gerhart should now affirm the precisely opposite as his true sentiments, is not so very strange. Indeed, it is rather characteristic. It is a rather common thing for that school to affirm one thing to-day, and to repudiate it in a few years. Even Dering Wolff noticed that, and drew attention to it. It shows the *uncertainty and changing character* of this conglomerate of beliefs.

We think Dr. Gerhart has involved himself in a palpable contradiction, from which he cannot escape. To show this still more plainly, we will here place side by side two extracts, the first from Tract No. 3 (1870); the second from the *Messenger* of May 6th, (1874):

*Dr. Gerhart in 1870.*

"In Holy Baptism grace is this same Divine life of Christ, given by the new creating power of the Holy Spirit to those who are by nature dead in sin, *in that by baptism they are engrafted into Jesus Christ, and are THEREBY made partakers of Christ and all His benefits.*"

*Dr. Gerhart in 1874.*

"All the benefits of Christ are received, that is, appropriated by us, and thus made our own, NOT BY BAPTISM, not in the way of any sacramental transaction, BUT BY PERSONAL FAITH, and by the EXERCISE OF PERSONAL FAITH EXCLUSIVELY."

An attempt may be made to reconcile the two statements by making a distinction between the objective power of baptism and the subjective "reception," "appropriation," "made partaker," etc.; but this will not avail. The contradiction still remains. All that Dr. Gerhart, in the second column, ascribes to faith *exclusively*, that he ascribes in the first column, *just as exclusively*, to baptism.



• *Reply to Dr. Gerhart's Reply in Messenger.* 303

While then it is true that that sentence was not a quotation *in words* from Dr. Gerhart, yet it correctly sets forth the *sentiments* taught in Tract No. 3, by him, and is a fair quotation *in fact*, which he will hardly venture to deny.

HEIDELBERG.

[P. S.—One of the poorest and weakest evasions of a theologian who finds himself helplessly pressed by his own erroneous views, is to do what Dr. Gerhart has done in this case. Our correspondent has shown beyond the possibility of fair contradiction, that Tract No. 3 does teach the view or views ascribed to the author, and that in designating that view with quotation marks, no wrong was done him. That the quotation was not a merely *literal* but a *real* one, amounting to nothing, excepting to afford the sham of an occasion of evasive complaint. The best possible proof that there was no thought or purpose of wronging Dr. G. or the Lancaster school, is afforded by the publication in the MONTHLY of his entire Tract. Besides, Dr. G. and his Tract were not the first to put forth in substance, and even in stronger terms, the same view, and not the last. It is the doctrine of the school, and an essential item in their theological scheme of an organic redemption through sacramental channels.

If Dr. Gerhart or his school begin to see their serious errors, and desire to give them up, they certainly have a right to do so. We would rejoice to see them return again, sincerely, to the good and safe foundation they have so unhappily forsaken, or from which they have fallen in the giddiness caused by their theological gyrations.

Only let this be done in the open and frank way of a candid confession of their mistakes, of some evidence of sincere regret for the harm done, and of an explicit renunciation of their errors. As the case now stands, they are in the awkward and ambiguous position of flat self-contradiction. Such contradictions may seem of little account to those accustomed to indulge in them, but they have a bad ethical effect.

Our Lancaster friends seem to be under some strange delusion as to their rights in the use of language. They appear to think that they may express themselves in matters of doctrine as they please, and yet to claim for their words and sentences exemption from the established laws of interpretation. For instance, when Dr.

G. says, as in Tract No. 3: "It needs no repentance to become a child of God," the sense seems to be quite plain, by the common and reasonable rule of interpretation. Who would suppose that what he means is that *all the benefits of Christ are made ours on the condition of our repenting and believing in Him?*" And yet he now tells us that he really meant this, and brings a heavy charge against us for having understood his former words in any other sense.

This is unfortunate for Dr. G. and his school, and naturally gets them into trouble. The fact is, that when they write on theological subjects for the public, they must consent to write under the ordinary laws of language, or consent to be constantly misunderstood. Among themselves they may have their own hermeneutics, so that when any one of them says "no," it will be understood by the rest to mean "yes;" or when he writes like a Roman Catholic, the rest will understand it in an Evangelical Reformed sense. But when they speak or write *pro bono publico*, they must be willing to do it under the established rules. Otherwise they will fall into the predicament of Noah Webster, who, when he spelled *kodjitchun*, wanted people to understand that he meant *cogitation*. Though even in such a case it would be easier to give what was meant than it often seems to be when the Lancaster theologians write.—EDITOR.]

---

#### SCHISM—HERESY.

MUCH has been said of late in certain quarters about *schism* and *schismatics*. Great zeal is displayed against both, and great efforts are made to excite the church to strong and active aversion towards them. Schism is set forth as one of the most grievous sins which can be committed against the Lord, His people, and His cause. Schismatics are denounced as among the worst of offenders, upon whom the heaviest spiritual penalties should be promptly inflicted.

For all this there appears to be good reason. Undoubtedly schism is a very bad thing, and schismatics are very bad men. They do a great deal of mischief, and injure Christianity in many ways. Dissension, bitter strifes, personal animosities, splits in



• congregations and even entire churches, are among the direct injuries done by them, and indirectly they result, for the most part, in many other serious evils. Besides, the Scriptures condemn them in severe terms, and contain many earnest warnings and admonitions against them.

Hence there is scarcely room for any difference of opinion, in this general view, regarding the matter. Whoever forms his opinions according to the Word of God, and the plain judgment of reason, must admit that schism is a wicked thing, and that schismatics are to be abhorred.

*What it is. Who they are.*

But here the questions arise, what is schism, and who are schismatics, in a church? Those referred to above, as displaying latterly so much zeal on this subject, not only denounce the evils, but assume the right of saying, or intimating rather plainly, that certain persons who differ from their views and schemes, and who have opposed them in their peculiar purposes and measures, are guilty of the evils denounced.

In like manner and spirit the Romish church condemned and bitterly anathematized and fiercely excommunicated the *Reformers* of the 16th century, as well as many who had previously tried to maintain the Gospel against Romish errors. Such were declared to be guilty of schism, and were denounced, and, indeed, shamefully maligned and persecuted, and even put to death with fiendish tortures, as persons guilty of "damnable heresies," and as most detestable schismatics. In principle that church has not changed regarding this matter. A proof of this is furnished by the conduct of the Pope and his adherents towards the so-called Old Catholics.

More recently those next of kin to Popery in the Episcopal church, the high-church ritualists, have been indulging in similar denunciations against the Reformed Episcopal movement under Bishop Cummins. Bishop Cummins and those with him are pronounced schismatics, because they would no longer endure the attempts of the high-church ritualists to introduce Romish doctrines and practices into the Episcopal church.

Were then our Reformed fathers schismatics, guilty of wicked schism, because a party in the Romish church, with the Pope at their head, which managed by political trickery to have a majority in Romish councils and other church courts, declared that they

were guilty? Is every effort to maintain and defend the truth against invading error in a church, schismatic, because the advocates of the false doctrines so introduced may revile it as schismatic?

Evidently there is room here for difference of opinion. But there is an easy and a simple way of deciding the matter. That way is by appealing to the Word of God.

*What say the Holy Scriptures*

on the subject?

There are three words, chiefly, used in the Bible regarding the matter, viz: *divisions*, *schisms* and *heresies*. The first two mean virtually the same thing. The third rather indicates the *cause* of the divisions or schisms. All three terms (as found in Romans 16: 17, and 2 Peter 2: 1, are employed in a connection which show clearly what is meant. Let us examine them briefly. Romans 16: 17. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which *cause* divisions and offences (i. e. scandals) *contrary to the doctrine* which ye have learned, and avoid them." Here the Christians of Rome are urged on the one hand cordially to welcome all who faithfully preached Christ, and clung to the true faith of the Gospel; on the other hand they are admonished to *mark*, that is, to note carefully those who might come or rise up among them teaching doctrines contrary to the Gospel. Such teachers of error are denounced as persons really chargeable with any divisions or dissensions which might be excited by their efforts. *They are the heretics, those guilty of causing schisms or divisions, as the result of their heresies.* The sin of such troubles is not laid at the door of those who might oppose the teachers of error. Of course the real sin did not lie with those. So far from such opposition being wrong or sinful, it was their duty to resist the false doctrine. And if such resistance caused dissension, and schisms or divisions, the whole blame rested, as it must properly do, upon the teachers of error. This is plain enough.

And yet such false teachers no doubt tried to produce the impression that all the trouble came from those who withstood their teachings. They would say—if only those troublesome, quarrelsome, contentious fellows would keep quiet, and let us go on peacefully with our work, there would be no controversy, no strife, but all would be harmony and peace.

Of course there would, at least for awhile, until the errorists fell out among themselves. An illustration of this may be found in



the troubles caused in the Galatian churches, of which Paul writes so pointedly in his epistle to them.

The passage in 2 Peter 2: 1, is to the same effect. There we read: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them," &c.

There is a reference here to what had happened in the early history of God's people. False prophets and preachers arose, who taught a faith which fundamentally differed from that which God had revealed by His true prophets. Such false prophets gained proselytes to their errors. For no errors are so foolish but they can be defended by some specious arguments, by which unstable or weak minds may be misled. In this way those false prophets caused divisions, schisms and heresies; for some, if not the majority of God's people, would oppose the errors, and "hold fast to the form of sound words committed to them. But the real blame of such contention and schism is not cast on those who strove for the old faith; it is cast upon "the false prophets."

So it should be in the case of "false teachers" that would spring up in the Christian church. Much trouble would come from their zeal to propagate their errors. Many "should follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth would be evil spoken of." Great dissensions, sore rendings of the peace and unity of the church would follow.

Who would be held responsible for this? Those who remained steadfast in the faith, who refused to be led away by deceitful errors, who resented the heretical innovations? By no means. The false teachers are held up as the guilty party, and they are made accountable for all the evils arising from their pernicious attempts.

*Schism or heresy*, therefore, according to the Scripture sense of the terms, is mainly the sin of introducing doctrines and practices contrary to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and in this way fomenting discord and contention, by compelling those determined to "abide in the faith" to withstand such doctrines and practices. And *schismatics* are those who, by inventing and teaching such errors, are the real cause of the controversy, dissensions and scandals which unavoidably spring from their perverse efforts.

There is no need of special inferences, or of a particular application. The subject as presented will suggest those of itself.

## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

### EDUCATION IN INDIA.

#### ANCIENT HINDU AND MOHAMMEDAN CLASSICAL SCHOOLS.

*Ancient Hindu Schools.*—It is impossible to learn at what time, or in what place, the ancient literature of the Hindús was first cultivated. It is covered by the shadows of a dim and unknown antiquity. There is no doubt that the upper classes of this people came into India from some place in Central or Western Asia, and that they are Aryan by descent. We can trace their origin through their language and traditions with sufficient certainty, but of their earlier history we can learn scarcely anything. It is probable that they brought their oldest books from their former country into India. The Brahmáns, the priestly tribe, say that they are descended from the seven Rishís, or saints, who are celebrated, and, indeed, almost deified in Hindú mythology. Their names are Bhrigu, Angirah, Atri, Viswamitra, Kasyap, Vashisht, and Agustih. It is probable that they were the authors of the earliest Hindú writings, the four Veds, or, if the Veds are still more ancient, the commentaries on them may have been their works. That they were merely celebrated professors of language, theology and philosophy, is evident. That they had sons or disciples, who succeeded to their places, arrogated to themselves their influence and authority, and thus founded the various tribes of Brahmans, is also evident. We cannot say when they lived, but it is believed that the earliest among them flourished nearly three thousand years ago.

From the time of the Rishís till the present day, the mode and extent of instruction among the Brahmans have been much the same. They have taught comparatively few persons in each generation, because they were unwilling that their monopoly of influ-



ence should be shared by others. They enacted that the two castes next below themselves should not learn to read, but might hear the sacred books, and that the fourth caste men should be accursed if the sound of the holy words reached their ears. All that we know with certainty of their schools is, that at a very early period Kashmir and the now ruined city of Kanauj were celebrated as the seats of Brahmanical learning, and that, at a later time, Benares and Nadiya took their places. For hundreds of years these latter places have had what we may call colleges, though they very slightly resemble American colleges. Learned Brahmans live at those cities, occupying their time partly in priestly offices in the temples, partly in their duties as family priests, like the confessor in Romanist communities, and partly in giving instruction in the Sanskrit language, with its religion and philosophy. Young Brahmans, ambitious of distinction, resort to them. The course of study consists chiefly of committing to memory a most voluminous grammar and dictionary in Sanskrit, and in reading systems of philosophy replete with hair-splittings, which are useless except in producing acuteness rather than strength of intellect. Learning Sanskrit in this way moderately well, requires ten years' hard labor; and to become a Pandit of reputation is a lifetime's work. Some few of the pupils used to learn astronomy by the help of some old tables, the authors of which left no equally qualified scholars behind them. Some learn a smattering of medicine, but according to a system exploded a thousand years since.

The desire to study the Hindú mind, religion, philosophy and history, through this sacred language, may naturally be entertained by some European and American scholars; and, of course, Brahmans desire it even more, from the power it gives them over the minds of their fellow countrymen. Yet a distinguished Hindú writer has said, that it is a life's work to learn Sanskrit, and when one has learned it he finds no literature or science in it worth knowing.

Not one in a hundred Brahmans ever could afford to study at their colleges. Very many of them only learned to repeat the Sanskrit forms of prayer and incantations used in their worship and ceremonies, with only a traditional knowledge of their meaning. Still larger numbers fell into secular employment of various kinds, and have no learning.

Nothing can be said about the mode of instruction in these

Hindú colleges, except that there was no system. Each teacher took his own way. They explained the meaning of words and sentences; and depended almost entirely on the pupil's powers of memory. No example can be found in their practice which is worth imitating; and only the exceedingly patient devotion of the pupils is commendable.

*Mohammedan Colleges.*—During the reign of the Mohammedans over this country, they had some flourishing institutions for the cultivation of Arabic and Persian literature and philosophy. The former was their religious language, and it was even more necessary among them to study it than it is among us to learn the original languages of the Bible, because it has always been a maxim with them that the translations of the Kuran are of no authority, if, indeed, it be lawful to translate it at all. Therefore they who wished to be religious teachers were obliged to learn Arabic. At the same time the Persian was the court language; and all the government business of the country was done in it. And in this was all the literature and philosophy for which they cared. Therefore kings and great men endowed schools for these languages. For instance, Shah Humaiyun built for himself a very large tomb near Delhi, and surrounded the quadrangle in which it stood with cloisters and colonnades for the accommodation of teachers and pupils. For the support of these he assigned the revenue of certain lands. Many others followed the royal example. Some of the kings, being zealous for their faith, assigned lands to priests near various cities, on condition that they should try to convert Hindús to Islam, and teach young men. All these schools were intended only for the purposes above indicated. They taught no science except what they thought to be the ancient Greek system of medicine. They cultivated logic and rhetoric with much success; and speculated somewhat as the ancient Greek philosophers did. But they communicated scarcely any true knowledge of the material universe or of anything in it. Whatever may be true in the accounts that we have of the learning of the Moors and Saracens in Spain and elsewhere, their co-religionists brought no such valuable knowledge to India. And now that it is offered to them, the most of them despise it. They have often said to me that God had given them the upper rank in the world by bestowing upon them the knowledge of logic, mental and moral philosophy; while he has given to Europeans only skill in material arts



proper for mechanics to know; that the realm of mind was theirs, and that of matter ours.

Most of the pupils in these schools learned no more Arabic than to repeat the daily prayers without knowing their meaning. Of Persian, as a spoken language, they obtained a greater knowledge. Their philosophy was often very daring, intruding into the sphere of revelation, and giving an account of everything, reminding one of the old monkish book, *De omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*. It not only provides a sphere for things that will be, one for things that are, and one for things that have been, but also one for possibilities—things that might, but never will be. Their history was entirely unreliable in most points; and even so far as it went was rendered valueless by leaving out all account of Europe with its multifarious relations to Asia. The Rome of Mohammedan history, as taught in these colleges, was Constantinople; and it was difficult to find a man among their graduates who had the slightest knowledge of Rome in Italy. Their history of Alexander the Great was utterly fabulous. This course of education produced exceedingly polished and disputatious men, but no scholars worth the name.

These old Hindú and Mohammedan institutions forcibly remind one of the academies and schools of ancient Greece and Rome. Their character in all countries seems to have been much the same, save that the temperament of the more northern peoples caused their schools and their philosophy to bear a less trivial character than those of India. The civilization produced by such a system of education has been similar in all countries—the elevation of the few and the degradation of the masses being its direct and inevitable effect. We have not space to dwell on this subject here; but it is one well worthy of the attention of the educator and the philanthropist.

Most of the old Mohammedan endowments long since ceased to be useful to the cause of education. Many of the missionary dotations of land have become mere hereditary estates, the original purpose of which has been practically forgotten. The endowments of the other kind were forfeited by the great rebellion of 1857; and the present government does not think it would be right to restore to their former position teachers who then plotted against the authorities that had protected them. Until this mutiny, the English had scrupulously maintained in existence

all the institutions thus founded, so far as leaving their endowments untouched went ; but when these schools were found to have been the seats of treason, and to have cultivated bigotry and overweening self-conceit more than anything useful, the government took no further care of them.

ANCIENT INDIGENOUS VERNACULAR SCHOOLS.

Before the advent of the English in this country the spoken languages of the people were despised and very little cultivated. The Mohammedans ruled nearly all the country, and introduced the Persian as the language of all their tribunals and of polite society. The Brahmans talked with the people in their dialects, but thought nothing worth studying but the dead Sanskrit. So it happened that the vernaculars were only used by the common people, and in private business. Schools for teaching them had scarcely any other purpose than to enable traders, landlords and clerks to keep accounts and village records. But the vernaculars are in no sense mean languages. They are pleasant in sound, flexible, and capable of expressing the nicest shades of thought ; and they are not difficult. The people like tales and poetry in their own tongue ; and a few books were composed or translated for them. These excited more desire to learn to read. Schools grew up in many cities and villages, in which reading and writing on slates, painted boards, palm leaves, etc., and keeping of accounts, were taught.

The teachers of these schools usually had very little education. Reading with hesitation, writing without any system of spelling or punctuation, and elementary arithmetic, was the common result of all their teaching. The school-houses were mere sheds ; the seats were the bare clay floor ; wooden tablets or palm-leaves supplied the place of slates and writing books, and fragments of ill-written manuscript that of reading books. No boys attended the schools who could not pay their teachers something, though the fees were exceedingly small ; and thus the vast majority had opportunity to learn, since five out of six families in this country are, and have always been, crowded down to the meanest and scantiest food and clothes with which life can be sustained. The boys were never compelled by their parents to attend school, but came while the teacher could tease or coax them to do so. Most of those who did attend fell off before learning



anything of consequence ; and almost all who continued in school were content with the merest elements of what was taught. Some who went into business as bankers or merchants, learned to write an alphabet peculiar to their occupations, which no one else could read, and acquired the arithmetic that was necessary to carry on their business. But this knowledge was very much oftener acquired during the business-apprenticeship than in school.

These village schools were at one time very numerous. A report concerning them says, that in 1814 there were 100,000 of them in Bengal alone. Probably this was an exaggerated statement ; for we find that in those days only one man in three hundred could read passably well ; five or six with difficulty, blunders, and uncertainty ; and not one woman in ten thousand knew a letter. This class of schools still exist here and there ; but recent improvements and government schools have almost put them out of fashion. It is probable that many of the lower class government schools, to be mentioned hereafter, partake largely of the character of the old village schools, and are only very gradually becoming better.—*From Circular of Information of the U. S. Bureau of Education, No. 2, 1873.*

---

SPECIAL ITEMS.

THE *Concert* announced in the May number, came off to the entire satisfaction of all who had the privilege of attending it. As a musical and literary entertainment it was a complete success. The *Norristown Herald and Free Press* of May 20 contains the following account of the delightful affair, which we give instead of any further notice :

FROM UPPER PROVIDENCE.

*Nature Revived—Freeland Art Adding its Charms—A Delightful Musical Concert with Choice Readings—Ursinus College—Happy Effects.*—Some one has said that doubtless better fruit than

the strawberry might have been made, but that doubtless none better had been thus far produced. So we may say, that doubtless a more beautiful district of country than that through which the Perkiomen passes might exist, but that it would be hard to find it. Just now, especially, when all nature has revived, when hills and valleys are arrayed in their most gorgeous dress, the fields all draped in living green, and every tree of grove and orchard is displaying its glory of foliage and flower, it is not hard to imagine one's self in another Eden. And then the birds, the blessed, busy, singing birds, all back to their old May homes, and so glad to be back! The blue bird, the robin, the swallow, the starling, the sparrow, the two orioles, and that plainly feathered, but sweetest of our forest songsters, shamefully nicknamed the catbird, because, forsooth, it sometimes cries like a cat (as also babies do) and that equally grave looking beauty, with its auburn dress, the copse thrush, the catbird's rival in graceful cuteness and bewitching song, not to name a score of others, all here and there and everywhere around us, adding to the enchantments of the season and the scene. Surely if

"The man that's fond precociously of *stirring*,  
Must be a spoon."

(and who will contradict Hood in this?)

The man that can't be stirred with scenes like these  
Must be a loon.

And of this *we* challenge contradiction. At any rate our spirit is so stirred within us by what we see and hear from early dawn (if we happen to be awake) until the evening dusk dies out in night, that with tongue or pen we feel constrained to join in the harmonious confusion.

How great the misery, or misfortune, to be shut up at such a time within the dull dumb walls of a city, and to be doomed to hear only the jargon of the market-place, or the clatter of iron hoofs and rattling carts along the streets.

Ah! but your good denizens will reply: if you rustics have nature's charms to delight you, we have the more cultivated enjoyments of art—the eloquence of the forum, the music of the hall, and the beauties of architecture! To which we answer very benevolently that we are glad, exceedingly glad, that the prisoners of a pent-up Utica can have such pleasures to make up in part



for their deprivation in other respects. But rustics can have them too.

And during the past week we have had one of them up here in *Freeland*, and one for the full enjoyment of which the inspiring attractions of nature served to make us only the more susceptible.

By a previous arrangement, the choir of Race Street Reformed church, Philadelphia, generously gave a rich entertainment of sacred music and choice reading in the chapel of *Ursinus College*, on Friday evening, May 15. The choir consists of D. S. Craven, Esq., organist, Miss Minnie A. Nevin, soprano, Miss Mary A. Bomberger, alto; Mr. N. B. Berkenstock, bass, and Wm. Channing Nevin, Esq., tenor. On this occasion, Mrs. D. S. Craven kindly consented to take the place of the alto member of the choir. The selections for the concert were admirable, and the execution was more than admirable, giving unbounded delight to the large assembly which had gathered notwithstanding the very unfavorable weather. Among those who had the gratification of hearing the music, were some who were not unfamiliar with the best style of voice and singing in the cities. But all agreed that the music of last Friday evening could not well be surpassed.

To give some variety to the programme, several readings were added to the music, in which Miss Becky S. Shelly, of Philadelphia, gracefully lent her service. Her rendering of "Sunday morning meditations of a young lady in church," was exceedingly happy, and her reading of the Pennsylvania German poem, "*Der Schulhaus an Creek*," brought down the house in a storm of applause, which would not cease until she had favored the audience with another piece. Wm. Channing Nevin, Esq., (a son of the Rev. E. H. Nevin, D.D., of Philadelphia), read in a style of elocution which the severest criticism could not but warmly commend, and which afforded the entire audience the fullest gratification.

Altogether the entertainment was charming, has produced the most enlivening, elevating effect, and left but one regret, namely, that we could not have it repeated every week. The ladies and gentlemen who thus contributed so richly to our enjoyment have our sincerest thanks for the great pleasure afforded by their delightful entertainment, and the *next time* they may consent to gratify us with a concert we think they may be promised, rain or moonshine, a crowded house.

URSINUS.

*Married.*—The Repertory will always find a place for such items of intelligence concerning the sons of *Ursinus*, as the following, which was duly sent in and is cheerfully copied from the *Elmira Daily Advertiser* of May 20. In the name of our entire College, we join the "hosts of friends" in Elmira, in the warmest congratulations to our esteemed *Alumnus* and his—well now, what would be the right word in the right place just here?—but we can hardly miss it by saying, his chosen *Alumna*, and our sincere prayers that the blessing of the Lord may ever rest upon them:

"A very pleasant party of relatives and intimate friends assembled yesterday afternoon at the residence of L. L. Barney, Esq., in this city, to witness the nuptials of Rev. F. F. Bahner, pastor of the German Reformed church at Milton, Pa., and Miss Mary Ella Carpenter, daughter of the late E. S. Carpenter, of the town of Elmira. Rev. Thomas K. Beecher was the officiating clergyman on the occasion. The bridal presents were numerous and choice, and many were the sincere congratulations bestowed upon the newly-wedded pair. They left on a short trip north, and will return to their home in Milton in a few days. The best wishes of hosts of friends follow them."

*The Catalogue for 1873-4* is out and ready for distribution. In form and typography it is somewhat of an improvement upon its predecessors, although they were very neatly done. Although these annual exhibits cannot fully set forth the prosperous condition of the College, they serve in a general way to indicate its state. The past Academic year was in many respects the most pleasant and cheering in our brief history. Numerically, the sum total of students is not quite as large as during one previous year, but more students have been connected with the several departments during the *whole* year than at any former period. In the Theological Department we have had 8 students; in the Collegiate, 36; and in the Academic, 75—making a sum total of 119. These statistics will compare very favorable with those of Marshall College, when it had the undivided patronage of the church. And in view of circumstances which need not be named, the success of the Institution has been as remarkable as it must be cheering to its numerous friends.

*The Annual Commencement* is rapidly approaching. Our friends



far and near will bear the date—*Thursday, June 25*—carefully in mind. Even a larger attendance than that with which we were favored last year is expected, and the occasion promises to be a joyous festival reunion. To be here in time, all who are not within two hours' distance by rail should be on hand on Wednesday evening. Arrangements will be made for excursion rates during the week. An engagement has also been made with the proprietor of *Prospect Terrace*, a delightful summer resort, with ample house accommodations, on the large lot immediately adjoining the College grounds, for entertaining visitors at moderate rates.

In a general way, the programme for Commencement week will be as follows:

June 23, *Tuesday*, at 8 P. M., the annual meeting of the *Ursinus Union*. June 24, *Wednesday*, 10 A. M., annual meeting of the Board of Directors. 2 P. M., meeting of the Alumni Association. 8 P. M., Oration before the Literary Societies by Rev. D. E. Klopp, A.M., of Philadelphia. June 25, *Thursday*, at 10½ A. M., the Commencement Exercises, including the orations of the Graduating Class and conferring of degrees. At 3 P. M., *Reunion* of the friends and guests of the College. And at 8 P. M., Entertainment at the President's house.

A cordial invitation is extended to all our friends to participate on the occasion.

*The Fall Term* of the College will open on *Monday, August 31*. We will promptly furnish any information desired by those wishing to enter the Institution.

---

#### RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

[THE following excellent article we copy from the *Rhode Island Schoolmaster*, whose editor is the Hon. T. W. Bicknell, one of the Vice Presidents of the National Association. The *Schoolmaster* has a well-deserved reputation as one of the ablest educational journals in the country.]

In educational matters what may be termed a German fever, is

now raging in this country. Before the victories of Sadowa and Sedan there were strong symptoms of the disease, and since then they have developed with rapidity and violence. Our youth, in numbers, are sent into exile to get a taste of German culture and manners.

German methods are indiscriminately praised at teachers' conventions, and by their journals. The German language is fast crowding the French from the course of school and college studies. How far this is the servile imitation which follows success, and how far a just discrimination of excellencies foreign to us, it is not easy to judge, nor is it our plan to consider; but it seems remarkable that so little heed has been given to the religious instruction which is a prominent feature in German education.

From one-fourth to one-sixteenth of the time is devoted to this subject in the German course.

The upper classes study the Greek text of the New Testament, church history, moral philosophy, and the writings of distinguished churchmen. The lower classes are instructed in the Life of Christ, and are required to commit to memory, metrical prayers, hymns, and the Old Testament history. From the first to the last week of his school life, the German student is impressed with the value and authority of religion.

In marked contrast to this, is the American method. The fact is, our youth get very little religious instruction, and that little in a loose and unsystematic way. The family rarely gives much opportunity for acquiring its principles. Even in those families known to be religious, social and domestic duties crowd into a few moments the rites of worship.

The church with the Sabbath school does what it can; but it reaches only a part of the people, and with little time for the object makes small advances in giving religious education.

The school ignores the subject, or rather, while fearing to neglect it utterly, treats it as a respectable but dangerous topic. At college, the old "Biblical" has become obsolete, and attendance at church and prayers being optional, Comparative Mythology will soon be the only study of religion.

This is a great change from the days when the New Testament was the text-book in reading, and the village preacher examined the scholars in the Shorter Catechism; when the college course was arranged with reference to the needs of future ministers.



Has the change been productive of unmixed good? Has the standard of morality in the family, the school and the State, been rising as the amount of religious instruction has diminished? Before considering this point and the practicability of introducing religious instruction into American schools, it is well to note that religion is a matter of education. It is objectively. There is no richer field of study than the religious history of man. The working out of the religious ideas of different races as affecting their physical condition and intellectual advancement is an attractive and fruitful field for research.

The sacred writings which have preserved these ideas are the master-pieces of human genius. They are as intelligible as the "De Corona" and the "Republic," demand as much mental vigor in elucidating their truths, and impart as much discipline from their study. If culture is one of the objects of education, no better means of obtaining it can be found than an historical and philosophical religious course.

Subjectively, religion is a matter of education. Its province is largely the emotional or spiritual part of man, which is analogous to the æsthetic sense in its capacity for culture and growth. However much may be attributed to divine agency in modifying the religious convictions, there yet remains a large field for religious instruction. By it the moral sense may be almost created, certainly greatly developed. The fact that spiritual power is transmitted from parent to child, like mental and physical vigor, shows that, like them, it is a matter of culture. Christianity improves in the individual and in the race as its teachings have time to produce their results.

Has, then, our country attained such firm moral principles that it can afford to give up systematic religious training? Perhaps no country presents such a diversity of religious sentiment. Since no influence is used to persuade or impel men to a moral life, except what the various sects can bring to bear, and as we have welcomed to our shores alike the disciple of Christ and the disciple of Confucius, we have such a Babel of beliefs and unbeliefs as has never been seen before. It is like a conservatory in which the productions of every zone are brought together; here a beautiful, heaven-reaching, palm-like character; there a dwarfed, perverse, cactus-like soul; here an oaken, heaven-defying front; there a willowy, bending, trustful nature. In this diversity it were easy

to find facts enough to establish almost any theory; but to a candid mind it is evident that this country has a bad character, and a worse reputation.

Our credit is not as good as that of more than one nation whose resources are far inferior. National loans are effected on bad terms and at a high interest, while State bonds are a drug in European markets. France, terribly impoverished by the late war, made better terms to the money market than we can to-day.

An intelligent German writing to this country, his former place of residence, says: "At no time has the American name been held so low in this country as at present. \* \* \* The feeling against the Americans is really so intense, that all of that nationality not personally known to us, are set down as rascals in these parts until they prove the contrary."—(*Nation*, No. 410.) Have we a much better opinion of ourselves? There is a widespread notion that the state and national legislatures are not very pure and patriotic bodies.

Some think that rogues have taken up the cry of Reform, the more effectually to carry on the work of plunder. Life is not secure at the north and south. Intelligent and good men look into the future of the land with anxiety and distrust.

Though we plume ourselves on our educational facilities—and we have reason to be proud of them—and boast of our religious liberty, which is fast becoming irreligious license, there are evils which these agencies have failed to reach; there are weaknesses in the national character suggestive of a sweeping flood of ruin. These are acknowledged facts. The causes and remedies are, indeed, many, but some of them are not far to seek.

Whatever influences may have conspired to bring about this state of reckless and impudent wickedness, we believe the chief cause to be the neglect of religious culture, and the consequent weakening of religious authority among the people. It is not that the clergy, as a class, have less influence now than formerly, nor that ecclesiasticism has had its death wound here; it is that our spiritual life is being choked by prosperity, and men find it vastly easier and more agreeable to shuffle off their consciences than their sins. Conscience, instead of being an avenging Nemesis, seems to be fast becoming like one of those physical organs whose function is undiscoverable.

The process of educating the moral sense out of a man begins



in the family and school, and ends in business and politics. Morals and manners are taught in some schools, but the motive held out for improvement in these matters is respectability. To appeal to God as a law-giver and judge, is to transgress the limits of a teacher's power.

Even the Bible is treated as a dangerous book, else why call in question its fitness for use? Scholars get the idea that religion is not good enough for the school-room, hence not good enough for home; or that it is too good for the school room, hence too good for business.

Failure to educate in religion is to educate in irreligion. Neglect is contempt. Science is taught because it is worth teaching; by not teaching religion, we say that it is not worth the trouble. No people can so ill afford to lose the results of such teaching as Americans.

They are trying to govern themselves, and must have some authority by which to enforce obedience to law. Tradition has little weight with them. They do not hold the name of King sacred as the Germans have always done. No class of nobles awes the commoner into submission. Respectability and expediency, then, are the only checks which can be put upon the wheels of ambition and avarice, and they seem quite as likely to prove spurs as checks.

Respectability cannot of itself offer a motive against evil-doing. It is highly respectable among the Esquimaux to strangle one's father. Conjugal infidelity is respectable in Italy. Stealing was honorable in Sparta, and some think that Americans show a Spartan spirit. Respectability being the mere verdict of public opinion is just as valuable as the source whence it proceeds.

Expediency, the "best policy," of course, has strong defenders, as a rule of conduct for a youth and manhood. But refine it is as you will, it never takes a man out of himself. It leaves him ready to defy any law, or, what is more common now, to make any law, if it is for his interest—that is, if he wishes; for who is judge of his interests but himself? Both respectability and expediency are floats on the surface of the popular will, and are like straws to resist the boiling tides of passion. Against them nothing can avail but the solid granite of character, and nothing can give character but religion.

The cry has been, "Let us educate our rulers." Already we

have felt the terrible strain on our institutions of the debased masses ; and we lift up our hands and plead for education. But what kind of an education shall it be ; of the mind, simply ? Then it is a useless cry and a vain hope.

Science may make a demagogue more powerful and a rogue more skillful, or a good man wiser ; but it does not teach forbearance and self-sacrifice. Mere intellectual vigor never prevented a man from being a traitor and a knave.

Of those who have been guilty of murder during the last five years, many have been far above the masses in average intelligence. It never prevented a single ruler or a class from practicing the direst cruelties on the victims of their power. The polished lords and ladies of Elizabeth's time, the first flowering of the English mind, were as remorseless and savage as beasts. Witness the beautiful and learned heads that dropped unceasingly into the basket, as if the scaffold were the only proper exit from life. And as if to out-face heaven, they did their vile deeds in the name of religion, of which they knew little of the form and none of the spirit. Any liberal education is not wholly without influence on the character, since the religious spirit so pervades the works of man that to study them is to get consciously or unconsciously food for the soul. History, language and art, bring the student face to face with the Sphinx of destiny.

There are the eternal questionings, and there, too, are the answers which faith and hope have given, as well as the awful silence of doubt. The student's answer determines the life or death of all in him that constitutes a man. Wisdom would not leave such interests to chance. But even the scattered grains of truth, which might lead the student to the rich mines, he will soon lose sight of ; for liberal studies are being shouldered out of their places by the young giant, Science. Can Science make citizens ? It seems as if it could. Science, it is said, shows the all-embracing grasp of law. The laws of nature demand obedience. To understand the value of law is the first requisite of good citizenship.

Science shows the value of law. Place the finger in the fire and it is burned. True, but what if it is a pleasure to be burned ? Vice and crime destroy, virtue prolongs life ; but what if life be not worth prolonging ? Moderation and loyalty strengthen a State ; but what if ambition overpowers patriotism ?

Moreover, science teaches the destruction of the weak and the



survival of the strong. It teaches theft, and murder and lust, and that without punishment. Its highest utterance is, "Love thyself." Religion says, Neglect of health, vice and disloyalty, are sins against God. Its central law is, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." The world is shaken by the struggle between these ideas. It is a struggle between anarchy and civilization; between property and robbery.

To say that all this may be true, but that religious education is impracticable, is to say that we prefer destruction to the loss of some pet theories in religion or some interpretation of Scripture. It is to acknowledge the lack of that spirit of charity and self-control which religion only can impart, and which is the basis of all good government.—*Christian Statesman*.

---

## EDITORS' DESK.

THE *May number of the Monthly* was found to contain 56 pages instead of 48, as was intended, to equalize the excess of the April number. This was owing to the press of matter which scarcely allowed of postponement. The reduction will therefore be found in the present number. As we give our readers annually a greater amount of matter (648 pages or upwards) than any similar publication for the price, we cannot afford to throw in extra pages, much as we would like to do so. The *Monthly* is one dollar cheaper than the *Mercersburg Review*. How much more it is worth than the *Review*, others must judge.

Have all our friends paid up their dues? They can easily tell by looking at the label with their address.

---

"*Our Church Paper*" on peace. Two articles claiming some notice have appeared, an editorial and a contribution. The second first. It is credited to *Albertus*. *Albertus* writes in a very amiable style. There seems to be a vein of humor running through it, which some persons might mistake for irony, and he gives his advice to those struggling for the faith of the church against attempts to subvert it, in a way that may appear dubious. Of this, however, each reader must judge for himself.

One thing is evident. This is, his full sympathy with the party of innovation. What he says, consequently, must be read and pondered with due allowance for his partisan sympathies.

Another thing to be considered is, that he volunteers his friendly counsel just at a time when the advocates of the new theology and its ritualism seem,

through their own exposures of some of their more serious errors, to have put their cause in great peril. Now Albertus pleads that they be no more harassed—but let alone.

The burden of his two-column article is, in sum, this: You who have honestly believed that Lancaster was teaching serious errors, were bound in duty to expose and withstand those errors. In doing so you have only discharged an obligation owed in conscience to the church. You have done it most vigorously and persistently. Point after point has been taken up, tried and denounced. The church, the synod, all have heard what you had to say. Now, then, you have done your duty. Your conscience may feel clear. The Synods do not agree with you. They and even the church at large, stand by, support, and approve of what you honestly believe to be errors, and have withstood as such. Now, then, you may feel justified in retiring from the field. After twenty years of such vigorous warfare you must be weary, and need rest. Go then and take your rest, for your own sakes and for the sake of the church. Feel released from all further responsibility. If the Synods prefer what you deem serious errors to the old doctrines of the church, and if the Professors and others choose to be liable for the consequences of maintaining and teaching those errors, let the burden of responsibility rest on them. Your hands are clean of the wrong. Go then, lie down, and *requiescat in pace*.

How wonderful the kind-hearted simplicity of this loving counsel. It fairly *gleams with nobleness*. (Our readers should know that Albertus is a contraction of *Adalbert*, which means to glitter with nobility.) It is so kind and generous to the *opposition*. Albertus is not like those who have for years been pouring the bitterest denunciations upon the heads of those who have been zealously "contending for the faith." He did not give countenance, of course, to some things said and attempted against the opponents of the new theology at Chambersburg in 1862, at Pittsburg in 1863, at York and at Dayton in 1866, and at Baltimore in 1867—not he. He was not at Hagerstown in 1868, or if he was, he lent no aid by word or nod to the outrage attempted there. He knew that the opponents of what were by them believed to be Lancaster errors, were earnest and sincere, and he frankly admits that it was not only "*their right, but their duty*," as he says, to expose and resist what they considered wrong. This is a new and significant admission to come from that side of the house, and will be duly credited and appreciated.

But kind and generous as Albertus is, his counsel can hardly be justified on grounds of Scripture or of reason. A good cause must not be given up because error may persistently stand in its way. Opposition to attempts to foist false doctrines upon a church should not cease because such opposition may not seem, for a time, to prevent the progress of the evil. So the Apostles, at least, thought and acted. The Reformers of the Sixteenth Century followed their good example. And sound reason commends the course.

But why does not Albertus have a word of wise and prudent counsel for the Lancaster party? Is he in sympathy with their errors, and trying in this indirect way to give them some aid and comfort in an hour of need? Surely, if any persons should be advised to cease their toils, the advice would apply



most forcibly to those who are striving with all their might to revolutionize and pervert the faith and practice of an evangelical church.

What has thus been said in reply to Albertus may answer also for the editorial.

DR. GERHART'S CARD, and his use of *Dr. Schneck's letter*. Much ado about nothing. Is it a ruse to divert attention from more serious matters? To what will be found in a previous article on this subject, we merely add:

1. *As to the quotation:*

That it may be found bodily in the *Monthly* for June, 1873, but not as a quotation from *Dr. Gerhart's Tract number 3*. The words or sentence were taken from the article of *Heidelberg*, in the January number, 1871.

That it sets forth fairly and truly what Dr. G. teaches, as emphatically as language can express a thing, and more definitely than writers of that school are wont to express themselves.

That Dr. Schneck committed a merely formal or technical error in giving the quotation as taken *literally* from the Tract.

2. As to Dr. Schneck's letter of apology to Dr. Gerhart, we are constrained in justice to Dr. S. to say:

That if what appears to be a copy of that letter, found among Dr. Schneck's papers, is really such, then the extract given by Dr. G., as all of the letter excepting only an apology for some delay in writing it, is very far from setting forth fairly and truly what Dr. S. wrote to Dr. G. Among other things, that copy contains such declarations to the following effect—that whilst it was a mistake to give the sentence as a literal quotation, the sentence sets forth nothing more than Tract No. 3 teaches; that at the first opportunity he (Dr. S.) will make the proper correction, but will substitute twice or thrice as many *literal* quotations, showing that Dr. G. teaches all that is attributed to him by the quotation; and that he (Dr. S.) exonerates the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY from all blame in the case.

If the above statements, or their equivalent, are contained in the letter sent to Dr. G., it is remarkably significant that he (Dr. G.) did not publish them in his card. If such statements are not found in the letter received by Dr. G., they still are a record of Dr. Schneck's mind in the case.

We may add that the above statements are in entire accord with sentiments expressed to us personally in the last interview we had with Brother Schneck, only a day or two before he wrote the letter to Dr. G., as well as in one of the last letters subsequently received from him. But more of this hereafter.

*Returned to the Defense.*—Some months ago our Lancaster friends retreated from the vain attempt to defend their theology against the well-sustained charge of being strongly pantheistic. But they think that they have since then found comfort in Ebrard's views of regeneration and related doctrines. So gathering up some crumbs from Ebrard, they return to the field and fling them at us. Now, first of all, with all Ebrard's excellencies, he is not by any means unchallenged Reformed authority. In the second place, Ebrard

does not agree with Lancaster on the main point (as shall be shown at another time). And, hardest of all, the Dr. Nevin whom Ebrard is boastfully said to quote with approbation, is the Dr. Nevin of 1846! But, as everybody knows, Lancaster *develops* a good deal in *twenty-eight years*! This is all just now.

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

FROM Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway, New York.

*The Superhuman Origin of the Bible.* By Henry Rogers, author of the Eclipse of Faith. Price, \$2.

A few weeks ago a minister of the Reformed church, and one who identifies himself with the Lancaster theology party, said boldly in a sermon to his people, that *without the living ministry the Bible was no better than a block of wood*. This is of a piece with what we heard a more intelligent adherent of the same school, and one who may be thought more responsible for his utterances, say in a sermon some years ago, viz.: that without the living ministry, the Bible was *no better than the Koran or the book of Mormon*.\*

To what extent such things are preached we cannot say, but have reason to fear there is more of it, directly or indirectly, than many suspect. With the *indiscretion* of men who thus betray some of the bad secrets of their party or theory, we have nothing to do. But facts like these go far to prove the value of such books as that above named, and that their publication at this time is to be warmly welcomed. The author's main point is, that *the Bible is not such a book as man would have made if he could, or could have made if he would*. It is a work of considerable power, admirably written, and meriting wide circulation.

*Forgiveness and Law.* By Horace Bushnell. Of this notable volume we have more to say than we have just now time to write or space to publish. It shall be duly noticed in the July number. For the present a single remark must suffice. Dr. Bushnell appears to be one of those restive, speculative minds which reject every evangelical doctrine which does not harmonize with *their* reason.

From the *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, 1334 Chestnut street, Philadelphia. "*Little Lights and how they Shone*." A delightful and instructive little volume for "little readers," and for Sunday Schools generally.

In the *May* notice of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, a strange typographical error occurred, which also involved the notice taken of Dr. Hodge's review of Darwin-

---

\* We give these sentiments without *quotation marks*, because, however fairly and accurately they set forth the facts, if such marks were given, and some dot over an *i* or cross on a *z* were omitted, a hue and cry might be raised about false quotations, and the main point be lost in the clamor.



ism. This latter notice should have closed with the sentence concluding with the word, "anti-Christianity." What follows in that paragraph should be transferred to the close of the notice or the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

*Lange's Commentary. Revelation*, Edited with additions, by E. R. Craven, D.D., of Newark, N. J. Translation by Miss Evelina Moore. With an index of Topics and of Greek Words, covering the New Testament volumes, by J. H. Woods. Under the general editorship of Dr. Philip Schaff. 1 vol. 8vo, sheep, \$6.50. Half calf, \$7.50. Cloth, \$5.00. With the appearance of this long-expected volume the New Testament division of Lange's Commentary is completed. The ten volumes in which this section of the work is comprised constitute a thesaurus of criticism and exegesis so thorough and exhaustive that it may with justice be called complete. Nothing approaching this Commentary in range has ever before been attempted, and the results of the investigations of Biblical students up to the present time, and the best thoughts of all previous commentators, are so carefully summed up in it that it must stand for years without a rival; indispensable alike to the clergyman, the educated layman, and all students of the Bible who wish to arrive at the precise interpretation of the Sacred Word.

*Lange's Commentary*. Seventeen volumes now ready. Seven on the Old Testament, ten on the New. In the Old Testament: Genesis, (1 vol.)—Joshua, Judges and Ruth, (1 vol.)—First and Second Kings, (1 vol.)—The Psalms, (1 vol.)—Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon, (1 vol.)—Jeremiah and Lamentations, (1 vol.)—The Twelve Minor Prophets, (1 vol.) In the New Testament: Matthew (1 vol.)—Mark and Luke, (1 vol.)—John, (1 vol.)—Acts, (1 vol.)—Romans, (1 vol.)—Corinthians, (1 vol.)—Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, (1 vol.)—Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Hebrews and Philemon, (1 vol.)—James, Peter, John and Jude, (1 vol.)—Revelation, (1 vol.) 8vo, per vol. in sheep, \$6.50; in half calf, \$7.50; Cloth, \$5.00.

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

As it would occupy several pages to report all the additions to the church during the past two months, it will not be attempted. It is the usual season of our largest ingatherings, and, without publishing any evidence of special prosperity, as compared with years gone by, the increase has been encouraging. A church maintaining, as ours always has done, the importance of an educational Christianity (though not at all apart from special interpositions of the Holy Spirit), should of course exhibit annually a measure of growth somewhat proportioned to its natural growth. This educational theory has of course its dangers, and may lapse into mere dead formalism. But the church has declared

its sense of this danger, by a special provision in the Constitution, which asserts the duty of proper attention to experimental piety, and requires pastors and elders carefully to examine applicants for admission to full communion, with reference to this vital point.

*The Classes generally* have held their annual Spring meetings. Only three, however, have thus far published their proceedings. As items of special interest we note the following:

*Goshenhoppen Classis* recommends the appointment of a co-editor of the *Reformed Church Messenger*. It took no notice of Dr. Schneck's death.

*North Carolina Classis* furnishes the following items:

*Mercersburg Theology*.—*Resolved*, That this Classis is pleased with the publication of Dr. Schneck's recent work on "Mercersburg Theology," rejoices that so calm and thorough an exposition of the errors of the Mercersburg system is before the church, and endorses the book heartily by commending it to the members of its congregations as a noble defense of the ancient Reformed faith.

2. That in the name of the churches of this Classis that have never faltered in their allegiance to the sound Reformed doctrine, we thank the venerable author for his labor in defense of the truth, and ask for him a rich reward in blessing on his effort to save the church of our fathers from error and disunion.

While these resolutions were under discussion, the sad news reached the Classis that Dr. Schneck was of earth no more.

*The Tenth Annual Convention* of the Pennsylvania Sabbath School Association will be held in the First Presbyterian church, on Washington avenue, in the city of Scranton, on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, June 9, 10 and 11, 1874. The Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D., of New York, will be present, and take part in the proceedings. The session will continue three days, and will be devoted to the consideration of home work, State work, school work, church work, training work and personal work.

*The Fifty-Eighth Anniversary* of the American Bible Society was celebrated in the Hall of Representatives, at Washington, on Sunday evening. Addresses were made by the President, Rev. Dr. W. H. Allen, of Pennsylvania, and by Rev. Alexander McLean, of New York, Representative Maynard, of Tennessee, and Professor J. H. Steele, of Massachusetts. The reports read showed that the total receipts for the year were \$664,456, and the payments \$611,728. The number of volumes issued was 900,572, in about forty different languages. During the fifty-eight years of the Society's existence, it has issued 30,942,786 volumes.

*A Tribute to Dr. Schneck's Memory* was offered in the following resolutions by a committee appointed to prepare them:

1. That it is with deepest sorrow that the Classis has learned of the death of the venerable Dr. B. S. Schneck, of Chambersburg, Pa.

2. That for the Reformed church this is a sad bereavement, coming in an hour when his great wisdom, prudence and piety were felt to be so much needed.



3. That in him we have an example of pure Christian life, untiring devotion to the Lord's work, unchanging affection for the church of our fathers, and of most decided attachment to the doctrines of the Reformed church as set forth in the confessions of the sixteenth century.

4. That it is permitted us in our grief to rejoice that our Lord spared our honored father to our beloved church to perform for her the crowning labor of his earthly life—the publication of his "Mercersburg Theology," and lay it as a gift of love, a dying offering on the altar of his devotion to the ancient Reformed faith.

5. That, with the whole church, we deplore the common loss of a father and a friend; that we humbly and tearfully bow to the will of his Lord and our Lord, while we mingle our tears with those bereaved ones that love him as their own, yet rejoicing in his patient, gentle, painful life—the church's precious legacy—cheered with the blessed assurance that the church's loss is his gain, and that he is now reaping the rich reward for his service done for Christ and his cause in heaven.

*Death of Rev. Thomas DeWitt, D.D.*—It has been with deep sorrow that we read in the *Christian Intelligencer* the announcement of the departure, on May 18, of this venerable steward of the Lord. Dr. DeWitt was actively and efficiently identified with the interests of the Reformed church in this country during the greater part of the present century. He was a man of sterling Christian character, a sound and able theologian, and a preacher of great eloquence and moral power. Although immediately related to the other branch of our name, his death is a loss to the entire Reformed church.

*MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS—Professor Elected.*—Rev. Samuel T. Lower, pastor of the Presbyterian church of Abington, Pa., has been elected to the new department formed in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, by the division of the department so long filled by Rev. M. W. Jacobus, D.D.

*New Publication House.*—The Board of Publication of the Baptist church has selected a location for the new building, having made a contract and effected the first payment for a lot on Chestnut, between Broad and Fifteenth streets, Philadelphia. The lot is 46 by 235 feet, extending back to Sansom street.

*Abandoned the Ministry.*—Prof. Austin Phelps, of Andover Theological Seminary, has discovered that out of a list of 646 Alumni of that institution, only 35 have abandoned the ministry.

*Presiding Elders.*—The *Methodist* is in favor of reducing the number of presiding elders, and enlarging the districts in the Methodist church. It costs the church now \$500,000 annually to support 450 presiding elders.

*Settled.*—Park Street Congregational church, Boston, has, after a prolonged discussion, agreed to give its pastor, the Rev. W. H. H. Murray, six months' leave of absence, and an assistant minister will take his place during that term.

*Congregational Union.*—The twentieth anniversary meeting of the American

Congregational Union was held last week in New York. The principal business of the Union is to aid feeble churches in building houses of worship, and during the last year aid has been given to forty-six churches in different States.

*Large Contribution.*—The Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions reports the sum of \$618,000 as contributed to its treasury in the fiscal year that closed last week. This is the largest sum ever received in one year, and is the largest sum ever contributed to Foreign Missions in one year by any Society in this country.

*Crystal Wedding.*—The crystal wedding of Rev. Dr. Joseph T. Duryea, of Brooklyn, was celebrated on the 27th ult., at his church, which was thronged with the parishioners and other guests. A variety of wedding gifts was presented; Dr. Duryea made an address, and the occasion passed off to the great satisfaction of all.

*Anniversary.*—The American Bible Society held its fifty-eighth anniversary on Thursday morning at the Bible House. The annual report states the receipts for the year at \$664,436.06, including \$333,238.37 for publications. \$39,011.83 from rents; \$171,284.87 from legacies; \$115,713.84 from donations; and \$5,187.15 from sundry items. The expenditures were \$611,728.73.

*Revival in Scotland.*—Messrs. Moody and Sankey are continuing their labors in Scotland with remarkable success. Mr. Moody declines all offers of pecuniary assistance, and they have been numerous. The Baroness Burdett Coutts sent him a thousand pound check, which he declined. She was in Edinburgh during all the time when these lay preachers were laboring there, and this offer shows her appreciation of their work. The revival continues, and is the most remarkable Scotland ever enjoyed.

*Jubilee Singers.*—The colored students of Fisk University have made fifty thousand dollars in England by their singing, and are about returning home. The students at Hampton, Va., are now singing in Boston, and the Carolina singers are busily engaged in giving concerts in churches. All these organizations are at work for the benefit of the educational institutions they represent, and not for individual profit.

*Reformed Episcopal.*—The Second General Council of the Reformed Episcopal church, convened in the church, corner of Madison Avenue and Forty-seventh street, New York, on the 13th ult. The sermon was preached by Bishop Cheney, of Chicago. Bishop Cummings acted as Chairman, and Mr. H. B. Turner as Secretary. A resolution was adopted inviting ministers of Christian bodies to seats in the Council. After reading a list of delegates, the chairman stated that a telegram had been received from London conveying hearty greeting from the Free Church there. On motion, it was ordered to send back an appropriate answer. The attendance is quite full, and much interest in the proceedings is manifested.

The following advertisement is from an English Ritualistic newspaper: "A



missionary shortly going abroad to take charge of a poor district, would feel very grateful for the gift of any of the following to take with him: Sacramental Vessels, Altar Cross, Candlesticks, and set of colored Stoles."

*The Westminster Review* mentions "the Romanist, the Calvinist and Unitarian parties" existing "within what professes to be one and the same church," and says that "the rank, wealth and privilege which the establishment secures constitute "the only bond of union between them."

*Dr. Wordsworth* has resigned his charge as Bishop of St. Andrews, Perth, and Dunkeld, chiefly on account of the disagreeable relations with St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth. As is well known, the services in this Cathedral have for years been much more ritualistic than the Bishop and most Episcopalians in the district approved.

At a late meeting of ministers and elders of the Reformed Presbyterian church, to consider whether they should reappoint the union committee, it was ascertained that there were five congregations for simple delay; nineteen for delay, with an inclination to unite with the United Presbyterian church; ten for delay, with inclination to unite with the Free Church; and two (Stranraer and Penpont) for dismissing the committee.

*Mr. David Sinton*, who recently gave \$100,000 to the Cincinnati Bethel, has informed the city council of that city that if it will designate a suitable improvement for the Fifth street market space, between Main and Walnut streets, to cost \$50,000, he will contribute that amount of money for the purpose.

In some western towns the ladies have adopted a sensible method of advancing the temperance cause. They have established combined reading and coffee rooms, charging for coffee the same price that is asked for beer.

*Mr. Thomas Carlyle* has been reelected President of the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution. The occasion of his reelection was taken advantage of to present to the institution, in Mr. Carlyle's name, a portrait of John Knox, beneath which he had written, "The one portrait I ever could believe to be a likeness of John Knox, February, 1874." Mr. Carlyle's gift is an autotype copy of the engraving made from a picture in possession of Lord Somerville for Knight's "Pictorial History."

The church wardens of St. Alban's Holborn, the most famous Ritualistic church in London, made a special appeal for Easter offerings for Mr. Machonochie, the incumbent, asking for a sum of £500 on the ground that the offertory was insufficient for the requirements of the church and the services.

*Dr. Sabine's* Reformed Episcopal church, and St. Alban's High Episcopal church are both in Forty-seventh street, the former at the corner of Madison Avenue, and the latter near Lexington Avenue, New York. There is a wide gulf between them, but Vanderbilt has bridged it over.

*It is said that astronomers, as a body, are less infected with the virus of modern skepticism and materialism than any other class of our scientists of to-day. On the contrary, not a few standing in the front rank among them are devout children of the church.*

*One of the most useful societies at work in India, is the Christian Vernacular Education Society. It has three training institutions, and 209 native teachers. The students in course of training are ninety. The number of children under Christian instruction is 7100, besides 5000 more who are receiving instruction from teachers trained by this Society in schools belonging to other societies. Four million copies of various publications, in fourteen different languages, have been printed by the Society. There are twenty-seven depots for the sale of books and sixty colporteurs.*

*Bishop Harris preached for Dr. De Hass in the United Consulate, Jerusalem, on Sunday, March 8. On the following Thursday the Bishop and party, including Mrs. Bishop Kingsley, left in good health for Beyroot, by way of Nablées, Samaria, Nazareth, Sea of Galilee, and Northern Palestine.*

*Methodism is flourishing in Naples, Italy. More than one hundred have joined the church recently. There is a flourishing Sunday-school, and in the day-school more than two hundred pupils find instruction. A commodious chapel, large schools, and minister's residence are in course of erection. Among the converts are two Franciscan monks, who are now preaching the simple truths of Christianity.*

*Acknowledgments.*—For educational aid in Ursinus College from : Rev. J. A. Peters, Alexandria (additional), \$5.53; Rev. Dr. Helffrich, Lehigh county, \$92; Rev. F. S. Lindaman, \$20; Rev. A. H. Leisse, Bermudian, York Co., \$8; Rev. Dr. Schneck, \$5; Rev. F. A. Rupley, Middletown, Md., \$50; Pleasantville Reformed church, Montgomery co.; \$20.00; Rev. Geo. Wolff, \$10.75; Rev. H. A. Keyser, Mahanoy city, \$35; Rev. H. H. W. Hibshman, Waynesboro', \$40; Rev. A. Spangler, N. Oxford, Adams county, Pa., \$57.75.

*For Missions*, from Rev. H. Hess, Pleasant Hill, Pa., \$14.70.

Our friends have the sincere thanks of all concerned for the above proofs of sympathy and active interest in our cause.

It may be well to repeat, that by the action of the last General Synod, every congregation and every single member is at full liberty to give his benevolent contributions as he thinks best. Let none, therefore, be frightened out of their right by the arbitrary attempt of any District Synod, Classis, or by any threats of compulsion or penalty.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—JULY, 1874.—No. 7.

---

DISSIMULATION.

THIS word is found but twice in our English Bible. In both cases it is translated from the Greek word which is commonly rendered *hypocrisy*, which is simply the Greek word turned into English. The reason for translating it *dissimulation* in the two cases referred to (Rom. 12 : 9, and Galatians 2 : 13) may be this. Our word *hypocrisy* expresses rather the sin of a person pretending *to be what he is not*; whilst *dissimulation* expresses both that and also pretending *not to be* what he is. And the connection, especially in Galatians 2 : 13, shows that this *double sin* was meant. A dissembler is a twofold hypocrite.

It is worthy of notice that neither word is taken from the Saxon language. Our old Saxon ancestors were too frank, too honest-hearted, and too bold, to give place to the feeling of hypocrisy or dissimulation, and so they had no word which exactly expressed the thing. Hence, the words had to be taken from the Greek and Roman, or Latin, languages, just as pretend, deceive, feign, and even cloak, come from the same source.

Paul had no patience with dissimulation, or with hypocrisy in any form. Tender-hearted and loving as he was, and ever ready to show kind forbearance towards "weaker brethren," when their fault was mere weakness, he could not endure the guile and deceit of dissimulation. This is clear from the way he speaks of the sin in Galatians 2 : 12, 13. In verse 12 he says of *Peter*, "For before that certain (persons) came from James, he did eat with the

Gentiles : but when they were come, he (i. e. Peter) withdrew and separated himself (from the Gentiles), *fearing* them of the circumcision."

Then in verse 13 Paul adds: "And the other Jews (that is, such as professed to be Christians) dissembled likewise with him (Peter) insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation."

This was a serious charge for Paul to bring against another apostle, and that one *Peter*. Nevertheless, he did bring it; and he pressed it, and proved it, too. He did this, not behind Peter's back, either. He openly withstood him, and chided him to his face. Though he was probably a much younger man than Peter, and was really younger in the apostleship, the Spirit moved him so decidedly to rebuke Peter, "because he (Peter) was to be blamed."

An account of the particular circumstances under which Paul did this, may be found in Acts 15. All sprang from the excessive zeal of a Jewish party of zealots in the church, who tried to bring again all Christians under the yoke of the old Levitical ritualism. They were not only for themselves dissatisfied with the simple terms and ordinances of the Gospel, but sought to stir up trouble in the church by having their Gentile brethren compelled to submit to their extreme formalism. Paul preached up Gospel liberty, and contended for it. He plead for what our high-churchmen called rationalism, subjectivism, and sometimes Gnostic spiritualism.

Now when Peter was with those Gentile Christians, he seemed to approve of their views and fall in with their practices. But when those Judaizers came to Antioch, and made a great ado about the rites and ceremonies of the old Israelitish worship, especially about the sacrament of circumcision, Peter was scared, and "betrayed the cause of the Gentile Christians by his inconsistency; he timidly yielded to pressure from the ritualists." (Lightfoot.) Thus he showed himself double-faced, either because he was afraid of the bitter spirit of the Jews, (for they were a hard set, and ready to handle roughly those who opposed them) or because he was still wavering in his own mind in regard to the matters at issue.

For this Paul accuses him of dissimulation, and of doing great harm by it.



*The Nature of the Sin*

thus named may be learned from the way in which it is spoken of, and from the example of it furnished by the conduct of Peter and his associates.

As stated above, it is a *double sin*. *First*, it leads a person to *pretend to be what he is not*, or to *hold opinions which he does not hold*. This is illustrated by Peter's case. Paul, and the Gentile converts generally, held that the Gospel abolished the ritualistic ceremonialism of the old Jewish church, and that they were not bound to observe the rules and customs of that ceremonialism. This was clearly right. Jesus Christ, the Head of the Christian church, had explicitly taught the same thing, and had set aside forever the old Levitical worship. And so long as Peter was alone with those Gentile believers, he accepted this fact, and acted upon it, or at least pretended and seemed to do so. He made the impression, and evidently wished to make the impression, that he held the same views with Gentile Christians upon the matter for which they were contending against Judaizing ritualists.

As soon, however, as some of these ritualists came along, and began their noisy and boastful agitation, reproaching and denouncing the Gentile converts as being only a sort of "bastard" Christians, but half-done, because they had not been passed through the Levitical sacrament, ridiculing them for want of taste and culture in regard to the ceremonials of religion, "without an altar, without a priest, without a sacrifice," without a formal liturgy, *Peter*, the same who showed such duplicity in the judgment hall on that memorable night, began to tremble, and to look about him for some way of escaping the anathemas of those burning zealots. His courage failed him before their fire, as it had done before on the waves of Tiberias. Accordingly, he is now seen going over to the side of the ritualists, and seeming to agree with them in their views. Either their show of argument unsettled his mind in regard to the points at issue, or he wanted to get out of the range of the bitter words or biting sarcasm of the Judaizers. He did not like to be called spiritualistic, unchurchly, puritistical, and a despiser of Moses. He could not bear to stay with what looked then as though it were going to be the weaker party in the church. So he now feigned to belong to the Judaizing party in opposition to the other side, and to differ en-

tirely from Paul. This, Paul called dissimulation. Paul evidently thought that Peter had not really changed his views or convictions, but that he was rather only playing a part, either from fear or policy.

It is plain enough, then, what dissimulation is *in this respect*. It is equally easy to see how such dissimulation may be practiced now.

One illustration will suffice. There may be an effort made radically to change the standard faith and practice of a church. Some persons may let themselves be drawn into the movement. But possibly they find themselves in a position in which it would be disadvantageous for them to declare their real sentiments and wishes. So they conceal their real views, and try to pass as friends of the old established doctrines and worship. Or after advocating the new views for a time, and rather boldly teaching and defending them, they find that the innovations are offensive to the great mass of the church, and not likely to succeed as innovations. Then they seemingly drop them, and begin to speak and write as though they held the old faith, and make the impression that they were really contending for the old faith all the while, but were misunderstood, or misrepresented. That would be dissimulation.

Secondly. A person may pretend *not to be* what he really is, *not to believe* what he really holds. This is the other half of the sin denounced by Paul, and charged upon Peter and others. The two halves are closely related, and strongly resemble each other. But it is not hard to tell the difference between them.

Thus Peter, in order to quiet the Judaizing disciples who had come to Antioch, openly or virtually disclaimed the views and practices of the Gentile disciples. As before, in an hour of temptation, he denied knowing or being a follower of Jesus; so in this case, he denied having any sympathy or agreement with those who claimed the freedom from the bondage of ritualism which the Lord had secured to them. And he did this by his *conduct* as well as by his words. He withdrew from fellowship with his Gentile brethren at Antioch; deserted them, so as the more fully to satisfy the Judaizers. Jesus had specially commanded him to feed the sheep, and the lambs; but Peter forgot that, forsook the flock, and fell over to those who had come to hurt and destroy it.



Doing this, he was guilty of dissimulation. And with his case before us, it will not be difficult to see how like deceit may still be practiced.

For instance, in the Episcopal Church of England there are those who hold, teach and defend Romish doctrines, directly in the face of the established faith of that church. But when charged with doing so, they deny the accusation, declare that it is false, both as to matter and form, and denounce as slanderers those who make the accusation. And then they use all sorts of sophistry and right-sounding language, in order to make people believe that they do *not* hold the Romish errors which they have plainly advocated, and are not Papists.

Similar instances are referred to in Episcopal papers in this country. Whenever a person denies holding views which he has really advocated, and has never squarely renounced, but still entertains in his heart, he is guilty of dissimulation. Every one has a right, for good reasons, or for what he thinks to be good, to change his mind, in whole or in part. And when he does so, and frankly declares it, no one can blame him. But no person is ever justified in practicing dissimulation. This will be evident if we consider

*The Evils of Such Conduct.*

Its great evil, of course, is its sinfulness. But there are particular evils, which deserve to be noticed :

1. It is hurtful to the dissembler himself. To practice dissimulation, he must wrong his conscience, make himself contemptible in his own eyes, and morally degrade himself.

2. It is a great wrong to the Gospel. Indeed, it involves treason to the truth. One such dissembler may do the cause of genuine Gospel Christianity more injury than a score of open enemies. Paul had bitter experience of the mischief they could do, and hence he condemns them in such strong terms, calling them spies and dissemblers.

3. But practically, the chief harm they do is in the way of deceiving and misleading unsuspecting and unwary Christians. Pretending to be sound in the faith, covering up their errors with fine words, avowing great love and zeal for the church and its creed, they blind the eyes of the simple-minded, and lead them astray without their knowing it. In this way whole congrega-

tions may be deceived, and persuaded to aid and uphold a cause which they would drive from their midst if they rightly understood and clearly saw its true character. But every means may be used to keep the people from seeing this, and to persuade them that all is right, until it is too late for them to escape from the net laid for them.

In view of such dangers, the Lord might well warn his followers to "*beware* of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy," (the same word which is elsewhere, as said, translated "dissimulation.")

Then let all beware, lest, "as the serpent beguiled Eve through subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

It is always unpleasant and painful to be suspicious of evil, especially in regard to those who should merit our fullest confidence. No doubt Paul felt this as keenly as anybody. But if even a Peter could practice dissimulation for a purpose, no one can be blamed for being on his guard, especially at a time when so many nets are laid to "entangle (Christians) again with the yoke of (Romish) bondage."

---

#### THE LITURGICAL QUESTION.

(*Concluded.*)

[In this number we conclude the re-publication of the Majority Report on the subject discussed. Although it has extended through six issues of the *Monthly*, and may have failed to interest some readers, it will be found of great value for future reference. Only let it be borne in mind, that in this Report the leading advocates of the new Order of Worship partly avowed their principles and divulged their wishes and plans. They have never disclaimed the views set forth in this Report. Hence, it remains as their manifesto to this day. They may have come to despair of present success, and may shape their course accordingly. But the Report tells what they want, and what they will try to get if they can secure it.]



So far all would seem to be sufficiently plain. Now, however, comes a new question, involving more difficulty. It appears to be a very general view, as we have already seen, that although the Provisional Liturgy is not yet exactly what the German Reformed church in this country wants, it is this, notwithstanding, to a great extent, and only needs some few alterations and improvements to make it all that the case requires. Such is the judgment which we find expressed by all the Classes in their action on the subject last year, and finally by the Synod itself at Easton. In no quarter has there been a wish uttered to have the work condemned or rejected as a whole. The feeling appears to be everywhere, rather, that there is a real correspondence between its reigning plan and scope, and what has come to be the predominant spirit of our church at the present time; so that although we are not prepared to go with it all the length of its liturgical scheme, we are yet not willing either to be parted from the scheme entirely, and given over hopelessly to an altogether different order of worship. There is at work among us an unmistakable liturgical instinct here, which is of vast significance for our present church position.\*

\*Readers will bear in mind that this Report was written in 1862. The Liturgy then before the church was the so-called *Provisional Liturgy*, published in 1857. That Liturgy was really a *double one*; that is, part of it, and by far the larger part, was what the Report calls, derivatively, a pulpit hand-book, with simple, non-responsive forms, after the pattern of our old Palatinate and other Reformed Liturgies or directories for conducting public worship. And even those forms in it which had responses, and were ritualistic, might be used, as the committee plead, without the responses, &c. By this plea some of us were misled and blinded. It was received in good faith, and the dangers of concession were not suspected or foreseen.

But whilst the Report has a general reference to the Provisional Liturgy, its argument all through bears only on the ritualistic forms of that Liturgy, which are less than one-fourth of the whole. And in pleading for that style of worship, the committee (i. e. the majority) go far beyond what is in those forms, as the reader could see, and more fully divulge their views and scheme, even to the revolutionary extent shown in the closing part of the section given in our June number.

In the opening statements of the part now published, the committee is compelled to admit (as above seen) that the trial made of the Provisional Liturgy from 1857 to 1862, proved that the church was not satisfied with it. But an effort is made to cover up this fact, and to produce the impression that the dissatisfaction was not with the novelties (ritualistic) of the Provisional Liturgy, but rather with some defect or want in carrying them out. This is done by assuming that the "*predominant spirit of our church at the present time*" is in harmony with the ritualistic quarter of the Provisional Liturgy. The Report assumes very boldly that the church is with the majority of the committee in their strong ritualistic scheme! It may seem unaccountable how they could so deceive themselves, even in 1862, in the face of facts. The evidence of additional facts since then has been so overwhelming, that a leading member has declared the scheme virtually a failure, and the attempt to fasten it on the church, hopeless and vain. In a way far more significant than scores of partisan Synodical resolutions in favor of the new Order of Worship, (which is the fruit and illustration, in part, of the scheme advocated in the Report), the church has shown that no such "*liturgical instinct*" as the committee claim, rests in her heart, and declared that such innovations as the new order attempts to introduce, will not be tolerated.

But we have seen already how far, for the thinking of many at least, this idea of alteration extends ; amounting to nothing less, in fact, than a change in the distinguishing character of the Liturgy itself. There would appear to be in the case some vague notion of a sort of intermediate ground, as proper for us to occupy, between the two liturgical conceptions of which we have been speaking ; where we might have something of both schemes of worship in one, retaining in the main the matter of the new Liturgy, but using it in the general style and manner of what our practice was before. This has been the ruling thought, probably, in the movement now made for final revision of the Liturgy. But the thought, we are bound to say, is vain. The Liturgy can never be successfully revised in any such way as this. It may be revised and improved under its own character, and within its own sphere ; but any attempt to change its constitutional nature itself can only result in destroying it as it now is, and giving us in place of it a mongrel production, which, for all practical purposes, will be sure to fall dead upon our hands from its very birth.\*

It would be in the first place, we say, to destroy the work in its present form. There is, as we have seen, a constitutional difference between the two schemes of worship, which it would be attempted to force together in this way ; the difference is not in mere external particulars here and there, but in the whole inward life and spirit of the schemes ; and there is no middle ground, properly speaking, in which they can come into any practical union. The Provisional Liturgy, in its universal structure, belongs to one of these schemes, and not to the other. Like a work of art, it has, in this view, its own plan, and is governed throughout by its own reigning idea. To take such a work to pieces, or to mar and change its parts with a view of turning it mechanically into something else, is necessarily to ruin it in its own order of existence altogether. We have no right to kill the Liturgy in any such vandal style as that. Least of all should it be required

---

\* As stated in the preceding note, the Provisional Liturgy is a *double* liturgy. Any one who has seen it must admit this. But in the face of what the book itself proves, the committee, finding that alterations must be made to meet the wishes of the church, insisted that the book was a unit. They ignored the simpler forms, and assumed that *the ritualistic* forms were the real part of the book. Why they did so, we leave others to say. But the falsity of the assumption is manifest. In assuming this, however, the committee took a defiant position against changing the book so as to cut out its ritualistic peculiarities.



of the committee that framed it, to lay violent hands thus on their own work. As a body, they would rather see it consigned at once to the flames, or in any manner buried in oblivion. The Synod has no right to make their labors absurd. As a work of literature, at least, if nothing more, let the Liturgy live.\*

The idea of any such murderous revision, however, as that of which we are now speaking, becomes still more intolerable when it is considered, in the second place, that it would most certainly fail to secure in the end what the church is endeavoring to reach, a system of worship, namely, adapted to her present liturgical wants. If the mind of the church be not in fact prepared for the order of worship to which the Provisional Liturgy belongs, it is not to be imagined that it can be satisfied with its forms merely by having them shorn of some of their peculiarities, and forced to take their place in a different scheme of worship. Such a mixed formulary, neither wholly for the altar, nor yet fully for the pulpit, must prove unsatisfactory under both views, and would have no chance whatever of coming into general use. Take away the responses, and strike out a few strong expressions on the subject of sacramental grace, would that change the tone of thought and sentiment which now pervades the Liturgy as a whole? By no means. This would only have lost its right associations; but it would be felt still; and felt, unfortunately, as something incongruous with these new circumstances. It is easy to predict what course, in that case, things must take. The Liturgy revised in this style would probably never, after all, be adopted, for the changes made with it would only open the way for questions of new change. But suppose it adopted. There would be no hearty resolution in the measure, no spirit of vigor, but misgiving and hesitation rather on all sides; and we should have for the result finally of this whole liturgical movement, reaching through nearly twenty years, just about as much as we have already in the Mayer Liturgy—a book of forms, sanctioned by act of Synod, and published as for the use of the German Reformed church, but allowed by the church at the same time, with com-

---

\* Here the report keeps harping on the same string. Did, then, the Committee mean to give two liturgical schemes under one cover, in one book, in order by stealth to get in that scheme which they preferred? Were the simple, non-responsive forms only rappings to conceal the real purpose of the movement—only the horse to carry the foe into the camp?

mon silent consent, to pass into general neglect, as being after all not suited to its wants.\*

We deceive ourselves if we imagine that we may change the distinguished principle of the Liturgy in this way, and yet retain in vigorous use any considerable part of its constituent matter as it now stands. Its primitive or elementary forms, of old ecclesiastical date, will become, with the loss of its sacramental character, but little more than a dead letter. They may be paraded still, with a certain kind of honor, in our Prayer Book; but they will have almost nothing at all to do with our actual worship. We shall have, in living practice, no Litany, no *Te Deum*, no *Gloria in Excelsis*, no *Trisagion*, no *Gloria Patri*, except as sung in one of Watts' metres, not so much even as the Apostles' Creed, in any regular use. Account for it as we may, these old devotions will not prosper and thrive, either in the spiritualistic atmosphere of free worship, or in the *hortus siccus* of mere pulpit forms, with no responsive service on the part of the people. Nay, there is something palpably unnatural for all such worship, in the fixed use, even of the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. They need the surroundings of a truly liturgical service to give effect to their constant repetition; and where these are wanting, the repetition never seems to sit easily on the worshiping habit of the congregation, but comes to be felt always as something mechanical and formal; a sort of stiff outward tradition, which, it is well, then, if all be not content at last to have consigned to oblivion altogether. So as regards the Church Year and the

\* The assertions here made regarding the *Mayer* liturgy need considerable qualification. For some years that liturgy was more generally used in accordance with its scheme than either the Provisional Liturgy or new Order of Worship has been in full. Further, the main reason for its gradually less use is to be found in the fact admitted in an earlier part of this Report, namely, that "there lay in the distinguishing spirit of the Reformed Confession, as such, from the beginning, a tendency in opposition to the constraint of fixed religious rites and ceremonies." The writer of the report forget this previous admission. Such forgetfulness is not uncommon in that direction. But how strongly this whole paragraph betrays the excessive ritualistic zeal which animated the writer and those of his party. "*Murderous revision*!" "becomes still more *intolerable*." What does this mean? The Provisional Liturgy, has *four* forms for the Lord's Day: No. 1 is ritualistically responsive, etc.; No. 2 has merely short prayers, or collects, with a simple amen to each; Nos. 3 and 4 are prayers alone, without any responses, and with only the usual closing amen. Now it was proposed, for instance, in the revision, to strike out No. 1, to erase all the amens but the last from No. 2, retaining the prayers, and to let Nos. 3 and 4 stand as they were. "*Murderous revision*," cries Dr. Nevin and his party. Why? Because for him the heart, head and soul of the book lay in the ritualism of that No. 1 form. That was the only living thing in it he cared to save. All the rest was but as a carcass. That was *his* idea of a liturgy, and if the Church would not accept of that, it should not be allowed to have any. This was rather a lofty stand for such a man to take.



Christian Festivals. Such a change in the constitutional character of the Liturgy as we are now supposing, must necessarily render worthless all that large part of it which is taken up with the Scripture Lessons and Collects for the year, and with the Prayers and Canticles of the Festival Seasons. If retained at all, this whole apparatus can be for us no better afterwards than so much respectable lumber. It will never enter at all, we may be very sure, into any living congregational use. It is hard to see, indeed, how, with such a change in its organic nature, even a single page of the Liturgy, as it now stands, could be retained, with any likelihood whatever of its giving either general or abiding satisfaction to the church.

Here, then, especially, it is of the utmost account that we should know well what we want, and what we are proposing to reach. Are we sure that we want a Liturgy at all? That is the first question, to which all our action on the subject thus far stands before the world as an affirmative answer. Then comes the second question: What order or kind of Liturgy is it that we desire to have, as best suited to the circumstances of our church; a Liturgy for the altar and the common use of the people, or a Liturgy for the pulpit and the special use only of the minister? Or, what is for us practically only the same question in another form: Do we wish a Liturgy on the basis of the primitive Christian Liturgies, and in the spirit of what was considered to be liturgical worship in the first ages; or must we hold ourselves strictly to the pattern of worship that has prevailed heretofore in our branch of the Reformed church, making the practice of the sixteenth century the beginning of our tradition, without any regard to the cultus of older times, and allowing no variation from it except in the direction of what we find to be the state of things in the church two centuries later, both in Europe and in this country? *Let the answer here be in favor of a new order of worship, more liturgical, in the old sense of the term, than the Liturgies of the sixteenth century, and involving a reform of our past practice, answerable to the genius and spirit of our church at the present time,* and then the way will be open for going on to revise our Provisional Liturgy with some chance of success. For this is the character in which alone the Provisional Liturgy offers itself to our consideration; and a revision of it in this view might be as large and free as any could wish; its general plan and spirit would

still remain unchanged. But let the answer to that main question just propounded fall the other way, as many are ready to assure us it must do on any full understanding of the subject; let it be settled once for all as the fixed judgment of our church, that we want no material change in our manner of worship, no liturgy of the organic, patristic, sacramental sort, but only a manual of forms for the pulpit; then will it be settled at the same time, that the Provisional Liturgy, coming to us openly as it does in that other character, is in no way, as it now stands, fitted for our use. But, more than this, it will be rendered certain, also, that it cannot possibly be so altered or amended, by any revision, as to become what we want; and that no such revision, therefore, should be thought of or attempted. The only proper course for us, in such case, must be to give up all talk of revision, to reject the present liturgy as a whole, and then, if we still have the heart for it, to take steps as we best can, for having another altogether new one prepared, after the fashion and pattern that we prefer. This will not spoil the work which is now on our hands, and it will give free opportunity for making the new work all that it ought to be in its own order and kind. If we are to have a pulpit Liturgy only, let us avoid, by all means, the monstrosity of having it made up to any extent of the *disjecta membra*, the dislocated fragments of an altar service. Let it be true to its own principle. Let it be constructed throughout on its own scheme of worship. Then may it be respectable, at least, in its sort; and though it should go the way afterwards of such formularies in general, passing into the shade of indifference and neglect, there will be no reason for remembering it with derision or scorn.\*

We may as well face at once, however, the ultimate issue on which, by our circumstances, we are now thrown. The question with us, as we stand at present, is not whether we shall have an altar liturgy or a pulpit liturgy—a liturgy with responses, or a liturgy without them—but whether we shall have a liturgy in any form or shape whatever. We do not believe that, at the present time, and especially in this country, a mere book of forms, how-

\* Many things in these two paragraphs must strike the reader acquainted with all the facts in the case, as offensively self-opinionated, dictatorial and overbearing. We have no time or space to notice them all. But one feature protrudes itself very prominently; it is the arrogant assumption that the writer is the only person whose judgment or taste merits any consideration in such matters. Over against that, the mind and will of the church seem to be thought of small account. *Cæsar aut nihil.*



ever excellently composed, could prove satisfying to any religious denomination; but least of all, is anything of this sort to be imagined in the case of our German Reformed Zion. Such liturgical feeling as there is at work among us, whether it may fully understand itself or not, looks unquestionably beyond this meagre conception, and is, in truth, a secret longing or yearning after the idea of worship in its original Christian sense. If it be not still strong enough to bring a cultus of this kind to the birth, it is at least too strong to be put off with what must ever be for it a mere sham birth in the other form. Rather than that, it will be ready to say, let us remain as we are, free to make the best use we can of our present liberty. The day for such pulpit hand-books, with us, at least, is over, as it seems to be, indeed, for Protestant churches generally, both in Europe and in this country. It must be now nothing short of full puritanic freedom in one direction, or nothing short of a full liturgical cultus in the other.\* No supposed middle ground can hold in actual church practice. We can never use the Mayer Liturgy, or anything like it. *We can never be satisfied with the old Palatinate Liturgy*, nor with any of the Helvetic Liturgies used in the sixteenth century, or since; and still less, of course, with any of the jejune formularies that were used by our ministerial fathers of the last century, here in America. No reconstruction of any such order of worship will serve our purpose; and time and labor bestowed upon any work of that sort, will be only time and labor thrown away. If we are not prepared, then, to go beyond this in our liturgical aims and endeavors, it would seem to be our wisest course now to dismiss all further action on the subject, and so to stand fast in the liberty wherewith we are already ecclesiastically free, allowing every minister and congregation to carry out a general scheme of worship in such way as to themselves may appear best.

And so the Report at last concludes. At least, it seems to be done, though there is no *finis* underneath. And what does it amount to? In brief we may answer:

1. To a miserably reprehensible caricature and ridicule of the established worship of the Reformed church, as maintained for three centuries.
2. To a most extravagant commendation and defense of a ritualistic scheme of worship which has been over and again tried and found wanting.

\* Here we have it again: "You must either take my way (our way) for it, or go down to the gehenna of bold, licentious Puritanism. You can't and shan't choose a middle ground. Our new order scheme carried out on the principles we have now prescribed, or no liturgy at all!" Fortunately for the Reformed church, this is only a paper ukase, impotent subjectivism, ranting in its despair of a ritualistic victory.

3. To a daring attempt to force upon the church a scheme of worship, and under it a system of doctrine, utterly revolutionary, and subversive of the true historical life and spirit of the Reformed church.

No such movement was ever before attempted in any evangelical church. Is it any wonder that whenever it is rightly understood the church will not tolerate it? Still less can it surprise the thoughtful, that the scheme has nearly run its course, and is likely soon to be numbered among the strange memories of the past. The greatest marvel now may be, that it has been endured so long and patiently. But if the means used to start it and carry it forward are duly considered, the seeming success of the scheme may be easily explained.

The *Minority Report* presented at the same time (1862) with the above, will appear in August.

---

#### DR. SCHNECK IN THE MESSENGER IN 1851.

[In our Memorial of Dr. Schneck, a promise was given to publish his editorial criticism upon Nevinism, published in the *Messenger* of September 18, 1851. It occurs in a notice of the *Mercersburg Review* for that month. At the time the *Messenger* was under his chief editorial control. But Dr. Fisher was associated with him; the criticism was submitted to his examination, and he approved it. We affirm this upon the testimony of two entirely reliable witnesses. The criticism, as published, caused intense excitement among the more zealous and unconditional adherents of Dr. Nevin. Dr. Schneck was severely (to us a mild term) censured for publishing it. At the next ensuing Synod (Easter), in Lancaster, he was roughly assailed, as we were told, for what he had done, and one member—one of those who has since apostatized to Rome—proposed, either publicly or privately, that he should be expelled from the body, or be subjected to a formal vote of censure. After noticing the other articles, the criticism proceeds as follows:]

“The leading article in this number is “Early Christianity,” and which will furnish us with an opportunity of saying something, although reluctantly, on the general subject of which it treats.

The *Mercersburg Review* has, for the last six or nine months, furnished us with articles from the pen of Dr. Nevin, on the “Church Question,” rising in regular gradation higher, and



*still higher*, until our head has become dizzy. We are at a *dead halt*. With much—with a *great deal* in these articles (with the "Anglican Crisis," in the former, and with "Early Christianity" in the present number) we are in full agreement with the respected and able writer. But we would be doing violence to our honest convictions, whatever these may be thought to be worth, did we not frankly make the clear and emphatic avowal—an avowal as painful as it is honest and sincere—that against no inconsiderable portion contained in those same and some other articles, both our judgment and our heart demur.

Our respect for Dr. Nevin, personally, has undergone no change. We believe him to be as conscientious and earnest in his inquiries, as it is possible, perhaps, for any man to be. With him it is not mere frivolous *speculation*, but something vital and solemnly practical. We doubt not but that he so regards every part and parcel of the system which goes to make up, at present, his view of the *ideal church*. He has read much on this subject, and has studied and thought more—more, perhaps, than any other man on this side of the Atlantic. He is therefore well fortified on all sides, and is capable of calling to his aid an amount of patristic and historical lore, that may be justly denominated a formidable array.

We are not so presumptuous as to pretend to a demolition of the Doctor's positions, one by one, nor is our paper and its editorial columns the fitting place for such an undertaking. All that we feel ourselves called upon to say is, in the first place, that in our view of the whole subject, he dwells too much on the *evils of Protestantism* to the exclusion of its manifest good and encouraging and hopeful side. And is it right, we might ask; does it not argue something essentially wrong within us, when we are continually disposed to see evil, and *only* evil—evil unmixed and unmitigated, in the midst of ten thousand times ten thousand palpable demonstrations, that the Great Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ himself, has been and still is in the midst of His people in the Protestant church. When we look, for instance, at protestant *Scotland*, or *England*, or *America*, and mark the moral footprints of Protestantism there, who would say that there is nothing to cheer and encourage the heart and confirm the faith in Christ's promise that He will be with His church alway? Or, if *not*, where then *is* such encouragement to be found? In Italy,

or Spain, or Austria? It seems to us there can be but one answer to such questions—and yet Dr. N. seems to be in doubt about it.

In the second place, he is *looking back*, back to the second, third or fourth century for *the church*, and seems anxious to conform the church as it now stands to *that* model—altogether in opposition, as it appears to us, to the idea of “historical development.” If there has been no *progress* from the beginning down to the present time, and if *we* must go back for a model, why then not go back to the beginning at once—to the *first* century, rather than to the second, third or fourth?

It is but justice to Dr. Nevin to say, that when he speaks approvingly of the Catholic church and her doctrines, he does not speak of the one or the other as it now exists, nor does he refer to the many abuses and corruptions to be found there; but he looks at things as they *were* in those ancient periods, and, we may add, also, as he finds the church and her doctrines in *books*. And just here, exactly, we do believe with all our heart—just here it is, that Dr. N. is so strangely and egregiously misguided. He judges of the evils of Protestantism from actual observation, with no slight predisposition to make out an extreme case. He judges of the other side from books—books written by the best men of their times, and who held on to an imposing system, with whatever imperfections and wrongs, because there was nothing else at hand to challenge equal regard. But can it be supposed for a moment, that if these ancient worthies were now living, either in Mercersburg, Boston, or Oxford, that they would spend their time and their energy in trying to persuade the Protestant world, that the chief end of man consisted in looking through the magnifying glass at the wrongs in Protestantism, and through a diminishing glass, at the same or greater wrongs on the other side. And herein, it seems to us, consists, in large measure, the *wrong* side of Dr. N. By it he is misled into the regions of mists and clouds. He lives in his *ideal church*, which *is not* yet, and is so wrapped up in it, that he has lost all charity for, and all patience with, the church of the present, forgetting, seemingly, though he knows it well, that through manifold tribulations, humiliations and imperfections, she is preparing for her glorification, and that it is equally true of her, in her collective capacity, as it is true of the individual Christian, that “it doth not yet appear” what she shall be.



She is measurably in bondage—she is in a state of warfare and trial, and we wrong not only *her*, but through her we wrong her glorious Head, when we expose even her infirmities in a manner calculated to “offend” and grieve his chosen, though it may be, weak followers.

“We could say more, but neither time nor space allow us to do so. Would to God we could have been spared from saying anything. Unless we are greatly mistaken, nine-tenths, yea, nineteen-twentieths in the German Reformed ministry will, with us, protest against the views lately brought out in Dr. Nevin’s articles. This of course does not prove the incorrectness of those views, neither would it prove the opposite if the whole church sanctioned them. We make this remark simply because we feel persuaded that others, like ourselves, will not so easily be driven from the “sure words of prophecy” and the sound, conservative God and time-honored doctrines of our Reformed church. We love and esteem Dr. Nevin, but we love that which we believe to be unadulterated truth more, and by God’s help we will not part with it at any price or at any sacrifice. We have followed him in some of his views, as we thought, and as we still think, from conviction. But lately he has traveled too fast for us, and we can therefore only commend him to God and the Word of His grace, sincerely hoping that he and we may be preserved from departing, either on the right hand or on the left, from the *land-marks* which God and our fathers did set.”

Thus far the editorial. As every reader must admit, the words were temperately and kindly spoken. The writer could have said more; and from facts which subsequently transpired, there is good reason to believe that the more he could have said would have produced a far more startling effect than what he did say. The facts were quickly hushed up; a huge hand was ready to smite on the mouth any one who might dare, in the interest of truth and the church, to intimate the actual condition of things in certain quarters. Men were to be screened, even though the church should be ruined. This was not the feeling of the party to whom the statement may apply, in the case which marked the Synod of Philadelphia in 1839—a case far less clear, and far less likely to cause general mischief.

That it was the right and the duty of the Editor of the *Messenger*, in 1851, to write as he did and warn the church of dan-

ger, no sensible person will question. If a Professor of the Synod might write such articles as have been published in the *Review*—articles assailing cardinal doctrines and subversive of our established faith—the editor of the leading church paper might surely be allowed frankly to criticise them. There is nothing, *to say the least*, in the position or immunities of a Professor of Theology in our Synodical Seminary to justify him in assailing, to any extent to which his theological distractions might prompt, the faith of the church which he was solemnly pledged to defend, or to ask that he should be allowed to do so with impunity. If he no longer heartily agreed with the faith of the church, he had his liberty. But that was not a liberty to assail it directly or indirectly; not a liberty to try to get that faith changed to suit his changeful notions.

And now that the feelings and fears of Dr. Schneck, as expressed in the above editorial, have been sadly vindicated and verified by the apostasies and defections, and other mournful results of just such teachings as he condemned in his editorial, he will be more honored than ever for having so far overcome his natural timidity as to utter the word of warning when he did. If only all in the church had been better prepared to heed it, and to act accordingly, instead of allowing themselves to be hoodwinked by specious explanations and deceptive apologies!

We cannot close this postscript to the editorial without referring again to Dr. Gerhart's recent attempt to screen himself and his gross errors on the subject of baptismal regeneration, at the expense of Dr. Schneck and others.

That attempt has been shown to be as disingenuous as it was small. By this time, we cannot help thinking his friends, if not himself, must be ashamed of it, and heartily wish he had allowed the insignificant affair to pass.

But what does it prove? Why, that after searching Dr. Schneck's book through and through, for some point of attack, for some means of breaking the force of its calm but overwhelming testimony against the errors of the Lancaster-Mercersburg theology, the worst they could find was a formal mistake in giving certain words of a statement as the very words of Dr. Gerhart, whilst just such words in such a sentence were not in his notorious tract. The sentence fairly and truly set forth what he had taught. Even



the words, in part, were his own ; but just that sentence was not literally and formally his.

If Lancaster has an answer to Dr. Schneck's book, why does it not come out with a manly, frank, and thorough answer to the charges it openly and unreservedly makes against the theology of that party ? There seems to be but one answer. It is that the Lancaster Faculty cannot fairly meet and honestly refute those charges. This answer we believe to be true. Hence, the littleness of trying to make a vast fuss about a "spurious" quotation, and all that sort of thing.

Could something more serious have been trumped up, rest assured it would have been brought out before now. But to try to create prejudice against the book, and to spot its departed author in the way taken, is evidence of a sense of extreme weakness and petty helplessness.

---

#### FOUL PLAY, AND A LOSING GAME.

The Lancaster Faculty, by the hand of Dr. Gerhart, has been playing at *cards*, and has lost. The hand that played such a false and deceptive and most ungenerous "card" as that thrown on the front page of the *Messenger* of May 6, deserved to lose. It was foul play in four respects.

1. In its general tenor and tendency, the whole bearing of the *card*, and its evident design, were to make the church believe that he did not hold and teach views which he had openly avowed and taught ; that in being charged with holding those views, he and the party to which he belongs were grossly misrepresented ; and that, instead of holding or ever having held such views, he had always held, taught and maintained the direct contrary (or, as he says, in very logical phrase, "the contradictory opposite.") All this tended, and seemed intended, to mislead the mind and feeling of the church in two ways : viz., by making the impression that the theology taught at Lancaster was all right, and that the Professors there have been grossly misrepresented and wronged by those who have charged them with

teaching doctrines at variance with the standard faith of our church.

2. The card further showed foul play in this—that Dr. Schneck's book, which was an open, direct attack upon the theology of the Lancaster Faculty, was never expressly noticed by them until after his death. The *Messenger* pretended to know nothing about the book by name, and keenly as the Faculty must have felt its exposure of their hurtful errors, nothing was said about it, lest the readers of the *Messenger* might find out that such a book had been published. For about *three months* after its appearance, they kept profoundly silent, hoping, no doubt, to kill it by their contemptuous silence. More than two months passed after the publication of the book before Dr. Gerhart wrote to Dr. Schneck regarding the "quotation." *After that* the first explicit notice is publicly taken of Dr. Schneck's book, and even then the full title of the book is not given, lest it might tell too plain a tale. Then, first a "card" exposing an alleged *falsehood*!

3. Additional proof of foul play is found in the specious and deceptive view which the *card* tries to make of Dr. Schneck's formal mistake in regard to the quotation. The mistake is magnified and exaggerated into something most "*false*, both as to matter and form"—something maliciously "*invented*," and injurious. Dr. Gerhart taxes his ingenuity in finding words to stigmatize it. He speaks of "*the spuriousness*" of the quotation, calls it an "*invented* passage," a "*spurious* passage," and twice a "*false* quotation." He brands us, as Editor of the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY, from which Dr. Schneck, by an entirely harmless error, had taken the quotation, as "*the author of the falsehood*." The REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY had published in full, word for word, Dr. Gerhart's Tract No. 3, so that he might never say, and that the *Messenger* might never say, that nothing but "*garbled extracts*" had been published in the Monthly. Dr. Gerhart knew that; but in his card he says nothing of this fact. The stigmatized quotation had been in our periodical for *nine months*, and we have reason to suppose that it had been seen there; but not a word was said about it until at the end of that period. It took Lancaster all that time to mature and fashion the seed into the monstrosity at length brought forth. The *matter* of the quotation appeared in the Monthly more than *two years* previously, in the article from which the Monthly quoted



it. But no notice was taken of the serious charge it contains. If the charge is false, it was as false in 1871 as now. But it was never complained of, or denied, until it was thought that some capital could be made out of Dr. Schneck's accidental mistake—an insignificant mistake at that—in using the quotation as though it had been taken literally from Dr. Gerhart's Tract! If this is not playing false and foul, no foul game has ever been played. And to make the case worse, the trivial mistake—a merely *formal* matter—is perverted into an intentional, malicious attempt, to fasten upon Dr. Gerhart an error which he never held or taught, and so to inflict upon him a heinous wrong—whilst in reality the quotation attributes to him only what he explicitly teaches in Tract No. 3, as has been overwhelmingly proven, and *as Dr. Schneck plainly told him in those parts of his letter to him which Dr. Gerhart thought best not to publish*. Who then is nearest the truth in this case—Dr. Gerhart in trying to swallow back the doctrines of his Tract, or the stigmatized “author of the falsehood?”

4. Here now comes out the worst feature in this whole case—that by which it stamps itself as foul play with a set purpose.

In the hope of thus effecting its end, the “card” publishes *what purports to be the whole* of a letter received from Dr. Schneck, excepting an apology for some delay in writing it. It is evident that Dr. Gerhart mainly intended and hoped by his card, and especially by this extract from Dr. Schneck's letter, to fasten upon us the sin of a wilful falsehood. A similar device was tried at Hagerstown, and Dr. Gerhart was in with the clique which attempted it. There the plot seemed to be craftily laid, and almost certain to succeed. They were challenged to bring an open accusation, and to afford, by a fair trial, an opportunity of defense. But the cowardly clique shrank from this. They thought they had a victim in their power, by sheer violence to crush him, and they determined to use their chance. He who rules chance, foiled them. For many years they have been watching for opportunities against us; not that they cared so much for us, as to hurt the cause we are trying to serve, and help their own revolutionary schemes in this way. Hitherto they have utterly failed. The Monthly is now in its *seventh year*. Month after month it has borne its open, unreserved testimony against the anti-Protestant theology and aims of the Mercersburg-Lancaster party. Often its articles have been written amidst the

pressure and cares of other arduous work. It is a wonder that something was not said at times, by a slip of the pen, or through momentary oversight, which might have been seized upon to our hurt. But the utmost vigilance, the lynx-eyed scrutiny of our opponents, could find nothing available for their purpose during all this time.

At last, however, the Theological Faculty at Lancaster, no doubt after much searching and consultation, fancy they have found what may suit their purpose. That "spurious passage," that "false quotation," is just the thing. Dr. Schneck is asked for an explanation. He returns a frank, an unreserved reply. By publishing a *part* of that reply it may be made to seem, (1) that the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY, or its Editor, is responsible for the "false quotation," and hence chargeable with falsehood; and (2) that Dr. Schneck impliedly casts the blame of the mistake upon that source.

That Dr. Gerhart wished to make this impression by his "card," even he will hardly deny. It made that impression on the minds of all we have asked about it, as it did on our own. And we confess that at the moment we were perplexed by it. We had the best reason to believe that Dr. Schneck had said much more in his letter to Dr. Gerhart than Dr. Gerhart published, and that the *much more* not published, greatly qualified what Dr. Gerhart did give, and was essential to a right understanding of the whole letter.

But we could not think it possible that Dr. Gerhart would keep back a part, and an essential part, of the letter of a departed brother, in order to make the published portion of his letter serve a purpose which the *whole letter* proved that the departed author never meant it to serve.

It may be well to have a tender conscience about "false quotations" from living writers, who are still here to defend themselves; it may be quite proper to denounce with calumnious epithets "spurious passages," attributed to such as are able to vindicate their writings; but what shall be thought or said of so using a part of a dead brother's letter as to make it seem to implicate a survivor in a crime of which another part of that letter fully exonerates him; or to make it produce impressions the very reverse of those which the departed writer wished to make, and which would be made by the whole letter, if the whole were published?



It may be thought very desirable by the Mercersburg-Lancaster party to crush down opposition to their unwarranted and hurtful efforts to re-inoculate Protestantism, and the Reformed church especially, with Popish errors. In attempting this, they may think it justifiable to take advantage of any means likely to serve their purpose. But there are weapons which, like the deceitful bow of Ephraim, are more hurtful to those who use them than to those against whom they are used.

In conclusion, we can most unqualifiedly affirm, and with a clear conscience,

1. That the *quotation* which Dr. Gerhart made the occasion of his unfortunate "card," was *not* given in the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY as a quotation literally taken from Tract No. 3, and *was not intended* to cause the impression that it was made from that Tract.

2. That we have never in the Monthly, or elsewhere, made a quotation from any of the writings of the party to which he belongs, which was in any proper sense false, spurious, garbled, or otherwise calculated to misrepresent the views held and advocated by that party.

3. That we never charged the party with a single false doctrine or hurtful measure, which they were not fairly chargeable with holding and abetting, according to a true sense of their own declarations and endeavors.

And if at times we may seem to some brethren to have indulged undue severity in the words of our opposition to the schemes and errors of the party, we must, without wishing to extenuate mistakes made in this respect, beg such brethren to remember the character of the innovations which had to be withstood, the artful devices employed in carrying them forward, and the bitter assaults made upon all who dared to oppose them. The truth is, that such schemes and as those of the party in question, deserve the severest reprobation.

---

TRUE eloquence consists in saying all that is necessary, and nothing but what is necessary.

## "TAKING TO THE WATER."

THOSE who do not, like ourselves, read Dr. Fisher's *Messenger* regularly and carefully, do not know with how large an amount of amusing matter it has been recently filled. We have every week the elegant and polished humor of the Editor-in-chief, and best of all, the "Department of Theology and Criticism," which really sparkles with *dry* wit, and is the most amusing literature we happen to fall in with in our reading. In this *Department* (the heading of which should be changed to HUMOROUS) in the number for May 20th, we find an article rich indeed in the peculiar qualities which move the risibles, under the title, "The Seminary," and which at once reminded us of the *hunter's* phrase, at the head of this paper. It is one of the most transparent cases of a controversialist attempting to elude the pressing pursuit of an adversary we ever saw. The entire article exhibits traits of the fox and the consciousness of being put to desperate straits. It is a clear case of hiding behind "the Board of Visitors of the Seminary." There is no need of even a spice of malice to make the case enjoyable to the opponents of Mercersburg Theology. The trick that would shift the responsibility for the heresies of the Lancaster party upon the shoulders of the Board of Visitors, may or may not be relished by those gentlemen; that is no concern of the friends of the old Reformed faith, and it only now needs that we show our appreciation of the true character of that article.

1. The writer of the article makes himself ridiculous by the pitiful whine he sets up over the *persecution* that he, his compeer, and those prominent ministers, suffer at the hands of those who defend the Reformed doctrines. Talk of persecuting all those learned Professors and a dozen of "prominent ministers." By whom? Why it is only a short while since the entire opposition to the errors of the Seminary were termed "a miserable faction," or sneered at from the elevation of Lancaster, as "ciphers." These "feeble folk" appreciably to *persecute* or annoy those who made believe they dwelt so far apart in their secure dignity, is a surprise, indeed. What a change has come over the spirit of those dreams. Well, indeed, it is something to gain the recognition of power—to know that the propagandists of fatal error and the bold



innovators upon the church's doctrines feel the hand of those who would resist their audacious proceedings.

2. It is a shameful exhibition of cowardice in those learned Professors who have for years assumed the air and attitude of the Philistine Goliath of Gath toward the Lord's host, and defied the armies of Israel. Now, after all the confident assumption and the boastings of their friends "to take water," and attempt to shelter behind "the Board of Visitors," and save themselves by appealing to their adversaries, "the blows you aim at us must fall on the Board of Visitors; if we are unfaithful, these men are still more so." When you expose our errors, you "wantonly assail them." At this point we are not dealing with the Board, but with the unmanly cowardice of daring teachers of heresy, who, when brought to the light, will take refuge behind their too indulgent friends. Why not assume a courageous attitude and bear as men the revelations that show your departures from the faith—your errors and inconsistencies. It is no intention of your opponents to cease from or hold back their well-aimed and telling blows. They strike for God and His truth as held by the Reformed church.

Indeed, and have the days gone by when when the enemies of Ritualism and Romish error in our church can no longer be pooh-poohed, and their dialectic skill and their learning ridiculed. It may be politic to call these telling blows *persecutions*, but it is also cowardly and a contemptible trick, only worthy of a bad cause. Where now are the men who recently, in our Synods, so bravely brow-beat the little minority of those who dared to love the dear old church; where are the men who gnashed their teeth upon any one who would not join in the idolatry of Mercersburg and cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians;" where are those sacerdotal ku-klux who set upon Dr. Bomberger at Hagerstown when almost alone? Persecution, to be sure. So David persecuted Goliath the Philistine!

3. As we happen to have a little leisure we will examine the composition of this "Board of Visitors," that the enemies of Mercersburg error are called upon to respect even to silence, and to refuse whose dicta is not Christian. They *represent* these Synods, and in all these Synods there are also those among the ministry as well as the churches who oppose the Nevinite heresies. This Board so composed, consists of twelve ministers, of

whom *seven* are D.D.'s. Does the reverence come in here? About *ten* of these, if our memory does not "take water," are students of Dr. Nevin, and infected with "the poison of heresy."

Of the remaining two it needs but to be said, that one is the pastor of the first church in the city of Lancaster—the seat, at present, of the heresies—and that the other is the Editor of the *Mittelmass* sheet, which, with all that pertains to it, is largely controlled by the Lancaster party and "the Mother Synod." Now, then, we use a very gentle term when we say that the Board is a *packed* one. Each and every one we hold to be a partisan; all belong to the ritualistic, Nevinite wing of the church, and are chosen by a partisan majority. Certainly there are ministers among the minority, if they be *not* "*prominent*," yet can make Professors quail and "take water" and cry persecution, who might in some sort of way fill a place among those twelve "*prominent men*." In Congress and State Legislatures, no matter how small the opposition minority, courtesy always—not Christian courtesy, but the fair-dealing of gentlemen—demands that it be represented on at least all the important committees. Does the Holy Ghost forbid that the majority in Synods should be courteous toward the minorities? The whole article is in wretched taste, but that part most so which talks of the "*veracity, fidelity and judgment of the members of this Board*." No one has put discredit on this Board but those who packed and made it partisan, and doing so violated all the rules of courtesy and fairness. One third, or at *least* one-fourth of this Board should have been selected from among the anti-Mercersburg members of those Synods. The fact that such is not the case, argues not only unfairness, but may also argue a purpose to conceal that which it is not desirable the *whole* church should know. We have no design "*wantonly to assail and misrepresent*" the gentlemen of this Board, but it is no breach of courtesy to say that it does not satisfy the whole church, and perhaps but a very small "*portion*" of it, to have them annually *declare* that *they are* satisfied with the teaching of the Professors. Their declaration may even be intensified and the examination of the students of the Seminary be declared *highly* satisfactory and orthodox when measured by the Heidelberg Catechism." The *church* also—not the priests nor a tendency—but all those who love the church and pray for her purity, would like



to be satisfied, but no data are given them on which to base such satisfaction. It is more than even *twelve* "prominent men" should demand, that their declaration should satisfy the church when allegations touching the character of the teaching at Lancaster are so rife, and when the practical results of the teaching are so much to the advantage of Rome. Why should not this Board take measures to satisfy the just expectation of the church? Can it still afford to ignore a minority that has *driven* their Professors to take shelter behind *their* authority and character? If it will and does, then the opponents of Mercersburg have a *right* to hold them responsible for the teachings of Dr. Gerhart's text on Baptism; they have a right to hold them responsible for the teaching of Rupp's article in the *Mercersburg Review*, defended and endorsed by the Professors—they have a right, and will hold them accountable, for *the denial of the doctrine that the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross is the only ground of our salvation*. Further: if this Board can afford to account all the anti-Mercersburg parts of the church to be "a miserable faction of ciphers" and by their dignity uphold their Professors who have "taken water," then the church holds them accountable for using the Seminary as previously at Mercersburg, to furnish the church of Rome with Editors for her "authorized churchly papers" and teachers for her schools. The Boards of Missions, Publication, etc., are expected to give facts and figures to *show* that they *are* men of "veracity, fidelity and judgment," and would be laughed at were they annually to offer their *declaration* that the moneys entrusted them were well and wisely expended. Has this Board ever examined the *system* of Theology used and taught in the Seminary, and if so, told the church where it is and what its *peculiar* views are. Why should not this Board, by a searching examination of the Classes in Philosophy and Theology in which questions and answers are in writing, be able to discover the doctrine taught on the questions where it is alleged that there is error. It will be easy thus to satisfy the church whether the teaching of the Seminary accords, or not with what is written in the *Review* and the *Messenger*. Let this Board publish to the church that which should be no secret, what students are taught and hold. Until there is thus, or in some other satisfactory manner, set forth what is taught in the Seminary at Lancaster as the *sufficient* reason for the declaration of the Board, the awakened doubts of the church cannot be allayed.

It will be of no avail to appeal to their peerless character for learning, or "for veracity, fidelity and judgment." It will not avail to call the just demands of those in opposition to Lancaster, "wanton" misrepresentations and slanders. It will not even do to declare that they thus disturb the peace of the church. We should not have made these allusions to the Board, but because they are made a shield for the Professors. We should not so arraign it for neglect of duty, had it not been that more was arrogated for it than there is given to any man or set of men, by Protestants. If this seems to be annoying, then set it to the account of the indiscreet procedure of the men who are in danger of drowning.

ULRIC.

---

THE pilot of a United States revenue cutter was asked if he knew all the rocks along the coast where he sailed. He replied: "No; it is only necessary to know where there are no rocks." These words suggested a deep moral and spiritual truth. Sermons, lectures and books abound on the temptations which lie along the life-course of the young to eternity. Over the most dangerous ones are lifted the solemn notes of repeated warning. This is well. And yet how much more frequently does the Word of God present and enforce, with all the urgency of motive love can suggest, the very truth contained in the pilot's answer—"the King's highway of holiness." Looking unto Jesus with simple faith, the soul is secure; whatever the perils that lurk on every hand, there are no rocks ahead. To a loyal spirit it is sufficient to know this.

---

A GREAT man once said he could persuade the multitude that the sun rose at noonday, if allowed to tell them so sufficiently often without interruption or contradiction.

There is an important truth at the basis of the hyperbole.



## **Ursinus College Repertory.**

### BIENNIAL ADDRESS BEFORE THE LITERARY SOCIETIES OF URSINUS COLLEGE.

BY REV. D. E. KLOPP, A. M.

(*Correspondence.*)

ZWINGLIAN HALL, URSINUS COLLEGE, June 24th, 1874.

REV. D. E. KLOPP, A. M.—*Dear Sir:* Permit us in behalf of the Zwinglian Literary Society to tender our sincere thanks for the able and interesting address with which you favored us this evening, and request a copy of the same for publication.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE A. SCHEER,  
A. E. DAHLMAN,  
*Committee.*

GEORGE A. SCHEER AND A. E. DAHLMAN: In answer to your request for a copy of my address, I desire to say that I feel flattered by the additional honor you have thus put upon me. I am only sorry that it was necessarily prepared under such pressure as to make it, in my own judgment, wanting in much that would be desirable. Yet, under the circumstances, I do not feel justified in refusing your request. I therefore place it in your hands, hoping it may accomplish some good.

Yours truly,

D. E. KLOPP.

Why has this and similar institutions been founded? Why are you here? Why have you banded together in these literary societies? These are questions which you cannot too often or seriously propose to yourselves for earnest consideration. They demand of you deliberate, conscientious answers. I propose to-night to help some little in the reaching of right conclusions. I do not expect to be able to give you anything new or very different from others who have written and spoken on the subject, that shall for a little while engage our attention. But if I can add even a little to the testimony you are daily receiving, and thus strengthen and help the work which your teachers and associa-

tions are intended to do, I shall have attained the purpose of my accepting your invitation to address you at this time. The subject which I have proposed for discussion may be called, for convenience,

*"The Necessity of Conscience in Education."*

Conscience is the controlling, energizing force in education, in the attainment of an education, and in the use of it in the different spheres and avocations of life. The necessity of conscience—conscience in full accord with the will of God—in education, will appear when we consider the nature and purpose of education.

The value and importance of education arises not so much from the present uses of it, the comforts and pleasures of this life which it may be the means of bringing us; but are rooted, rather, in the very nature of our being and destiny. That it is immediately useful cannot be denied; but its true importance reaches far beyond the present and merely temporal. The necessity and value of education come from the fact that, while man is the very crown and glory of the visible creation, he is this not in immediate actualization. Rather, this is his destiny; he has the power, if rightly trained, to become all this.

The seed has the power not only of reproducing itself singly, but of multiplying itself, and continuing and developing its life indefinitely. But this power or possibility of seed-life must be awakened, stimulated, watched and fed at every stage of development. Thus it does not so much gather in material, and in this way become an aggregated bulk—like a heap of sand, grain added unto grain, until the whole be formed—but it grows. It does not only get larger and stronger, but has the power of taking up and assimilating these materials unto itself, so as to make them an organic part of itself.

So man, mentally and spiritually, has the power of indefinite growth and expansion. But it is a possibility rather than an actual attainment. To the end, therefore, that he may reach forward and gain the prize of his high calling, he must be awakened to a consciousness of himself—his nature and his destiny. But he must learn not only his own nature and destiny, he must also understand the relation she holds and the conditions on which his growth and development depends. In this way he will not be on the way of life for himself alone, but thus, too, will his



*Biennial Address before Ursinus College.* 363

usefulness to himself and others be reached. This is the starting point of all true education. Education is thus the continual actualization and practical answering in life of these questions: What am I? Where am I? and Whither am I? Our whole existence is a success or failure in proportion as we answer correctly or incorrectly these questions. *The value and importance of education are measured, then, only by the almost infinite possibilities of man's nature, and the glory of his immortal destiny.*

The Book of books asserts that "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork." "For His glory they are and were created." If this be true of the merely natural and earthly, how much more true of man, whose glory is in his intelligence and spiritual nature. To become God-like. In an intelligent way, to cultivate our being—not in any blind, forced submission to God, but in true freedom, to bring all our powers into loving and cheerful obedience to the will of God, is real education. Such an education does not mean the mere gathering of a fact or truth here and there, now and then, as rapidly as possible, and thus make a great bulk of known things; but a training of the powers and possibilities of our being, according to the laws of our nature as created in the image of God, a growing thus into conformity to the highest, the best, the divine. In this way we do not so much know more and more, but from day to day *grow* more and more in the *power* to know more, and know *all* more clearly. As we thus come nearer to manhood, just in this proportion we lay aside childish things, until from now knowing in *part*, we shall at last know even as we are known; and from seeing as through a glass darkly, we shall be able finally to see face to face."

How, in this view, the importance of true education rises high above the merely utilitarian into the regions of the wonderfully grand and glorious, as we start in the very morning of our being and follow the process of the unfolding and ever growing possibilities of our nature, into the boundless beyond! How thus all life, even in the humblest stations and most limited spheres, takes on a purer and holier meaning! For life in every department then becomes the condition in which the foundations of endless growth and progression are laid.

Hail, all hail! everything which helps to move in such earnest and practical way, and helps to lay the foundations of our work

broad and deep, and to cultivate and train for the highest and noblest ends the powers of man !

Such being the nature and end of education, it is at once clear that there must be underlying it, going with it throughout, the highest moral and religious purpose. There must be a governing, all-controlling power within. There must be a regenerated conscience, awakened and directed by the Spirit of God. And this conscience and ever-present voice of God within us, speaking to the soul of man, must be trained and strengthened by an obedience constantly and cheerfully rendered.

The educational superstructure, no matter how fair and otherwise seemingly harmonious—no matter how beautiful to the eye of the beholder—that rests not on the foundation of a wakeful and sensitive conscience, that keeps constantly in view the higher and holier relations of our being and destiny, will not bear even the test of the storms of life ; it will fall at last, and drag along with it in the fall, much else in the common ruin. An educational growth that does not root itself in deep-seated moral character, however clothed with leaves, and blossoming most richly, will be fruitless of a real and valuable harvest of good, to the possessor and to the world in which he moves, and where God has placed him for the purpose of helping to solve correctly and successfully the problem of his being.

There is much, very much that passes current as true education, which is entirely different from this. Schools and colleges, and literary and scientific associations, are regarded as having served their purposes when they put young men and women in the way of earning a livelihood, or gratifying the ambitions, or pleasing the tastes, or beguiling the hours of those who have leisure. But in any right view of the matter, the associations, the relations, the necessary activities, however important, each and all of them in their several places can be, at least, only the scaffolding. They must not be mistaken for the building itself. The scaffolding of life is important, necessary, indeed, while the building is in process of erection, but it is only a means ; and when the end is reached, when the building itself stands complete in all the architectural beauty with which the great master builder designed the whole, the scaffolding having served the purposes of it, must be taken down and removed. We must seek for the true meaning of education in the nature of man's being and relations as these



hold, not only in time, but in eternity. From this, though by no possible means exhaustive of the nature of true education, we may readily see not only the importance of an enlightened conscience, made sensitive by the renewal of the spirit, and trained into living conformity with the will of God, but the absolute necessity of it in order to the proper training and application of our physical, mental and spiritual powers.

Another thing, if not an integral part of the subject, is still closely allied to it, and must not be left out of the case, as we have now been considering it. It is a fact which, it seems to me, only the unthinking can fail to see, that in the great universe of God there is a place for everything, and something for every place. So, too, there must be a place for every human being, and as no one place, position or relation is, in every particular, exactly like every other, there must be in that wise administration which we readily concede to the governor of the universe, some one particularly endowed for some place or work. To find that place and properly fit each one of us for the proper filling of it, can be no small part of a true education. This at once requires a setting aside of merely personal desires, a regard for the general good, a deep-seated conscientious respect for the purposes of God in our creation and relations.

There lies in this fact the call of God to every individual, which he is bound to heed. Though success ought not to be the first great object of life, yet in the way of God's appointment alone is found all true success, from the lowest to the highest walks of life. Indeed, the truth just mentioned obliterates all real distinctions between the higher and lower in the sphere of necessary human activities. It lifts every place and work into the regions of the noble, the good, the useful, the honorable. The laborer and the artisan are as truly nobles, as the statesman and ruler of nations. To be true to ourselves, to our fellow-men, and to God, is the preëminent duty and privilege of every man and woman that lives.

To bring them to a clear consciousness of this, is what calls so loudly for a truly Christian conscience in all the departments of education ; but no place more so than just in institutions like this, in which, for the time, you, young gentlemen, find temporarily your home. And in this Christian institution, there is no department where you so need to cultivate, according to the will of

God, a sensitive, enlightened conscience—a sense of the living presence of God's voice within you. Ruled by such a governing power, you will ever keep before yourselves the true nature and purposes of your education. You will be true in every relation, no matter how subordinate or exalted, in which you now or hereafter find yourselves. You will search after truth, because you would know the truth. You will study and act with a proper sense of the responsibility which every position in life will bring with it for you. The duty and privilege to be true to your abilities and opportunities will press you to be conscientiously active in the performance of your literary exercises, and this not only, as is too often the case, because you would be regarded by your fellow-members as those who stand first. Your great motive to obedience to the laws of your college, fidelity in your studies, respect for your teachers, will not, cannot, in the very nature of the case, lie in the hope of reward in the way of honors conferred by the Faculty on the day of graduation, but it will be found in the consciousness of the higher call of God to each one of you to be true to yourselves, and the persons and things with which you have to do.

You will go forth from this place, having been faithful while here, carrying with you everywhere the same honest purposes, sincere desires, elevated and becoming stronger by an ever-growing and enlightened conscience into the several walks of life to which you may be called.

As merchants, you cannot regard it as your business simply to gain wealth and ease for yourselves—as statesmen, to win fame and place—the physician as charged with the duty of making money or gaining a name, but to ameliorate the condition of man. The true lawyer will not use his profession and claim it as a legitimate means of robbing his client; the teacher raises his work beyond conception. Above all, the ambassador of Christ will not regard the gaining of any personal ecclesiastical end as the work of life, but above all will be for him the glory of God and the salvation of men. None of these, yea, no place or position will be prostituted, as they now too often are, to low, base ends, when an enlightened Christian conscience holds the reigns in education and the educated.

With such a training—and it depends most of all upon yourselves whether it shall be such or not—you will most truly answer



the questions, practically, for yourselves and others—What am I? whence am I? whither am I?

You will show yourselves, and feel that man is exalted to be a coworker with God. Avocations in life, professions, will be conditions, providential means of reaching the good, the holy, the Godlike. Thus trained, you may be each one a power in advancing the cause of truth and right, elevating the race by being living illustrations of what you, from time to time, discover in science, art and life, and honor to your Alma Mater, and a blessing to yourselves and the world.

---

THE ENGLISH CLASSICS.

[THE following oration was delivered by a member of the graduating class at the late Commencement. Others, as they are handed in, will follow in August and September]:

The literature of the English language, in the broadest sense, may be said to include all manuscripts and books written in English; yet comparatively few of them, and of their authors, can be profitably known. It is impossible, to say nothing of the past, to read a tithe of what is written at the present time. But under the term, *English Classics*, we will include only those works, and mention a few whose artistic merit has made them a permanent possession of the mind of all English people, and holds them there, not only through years, but through centuries. Of this kind of literature, however, very little appears, taking the broad sense of the term.

The English classics are essentially of an artistic character; poetry is the chief product of English literature, and all its creations hold their ground by completeness and beauty of form. It is not needful to show how elegant and reflective literature, especially, tends to moralize, to soften and to adorn the soul and life of man.

A regard for our national authors enters into and forms part of the most sacred feelings of every educated man, and it would not be easy to estimate in what degree it is to this sentiment that we are indebted for all of good and great that centre in the name of England, which is the birthplace of an English

nationality, the English language, and an English literature. These three sprung up together in the fourteenth century, with Chaucer at the head. He, the greatest of writers, has been justly called the Father of English Literature. Before, and until his time, the language was considered semi-barbarous, and there was no institution of learning in which the English language was suffered to be taught; he being the first educated English layman whose genius spurned the fetters which bound his class, and who dared to lay his profane hands upon the altar of Poesy. It was he who rescued our language from chaos, and is likened to a genial day of English spring, when a brilliant sun enlivens the face of nature with unusual warmth and lustre, but is succeeded by the redoubled horrors of winter, "and those tender buds and early blossoms which are called forth by the transient gleam of a temporary sunshine, are nipped by frost and torn by tempest." His poems everywhere abound in classical illustrations. His genius was not, indeed, fully developed until he was advanced in years. When about sixty years of age, in the evening of his life, he composed his greatest poem, the "Canterbury Tales," which gave him the title: The Morning Star of English poetry. The difficulty of accomplishing such a great work, and the value of it when accomplished, will appear the greater when we remember how ill-qualified was then the English language for the expression of poetic thoughts. It was a mixture of several languages, not yet settled upon definite principles of construction. After the death of Chaucer, not only poetry, but all other branches of literature continued to decline. About two hundred years had elapsed before another man of great eminence appeared in the walks of literature, namely, Edmund Spenser. It was he who again gave it new life and vigor. He was an amateur in language, and possessed the abstract faculty of poetry in a higher degree than any other poet of England. The riches of his mind now belong to all who speak the English tongue, and it is hoped that all may seize them with a miser's eagerness and possess themselves of the whole. Reading the greatest of his poems, "The Faery Queen," we cannot help but fall in love with the author, and be persuaded that the utmost sweetness of disposition and purest sincerity and goodness of heart distinguish him; and whose language, by its simplicity and energy, breathes the very stamp and force of truth. Humility and piety were the leading features of his life, and still



are the most delightful characteristics of his poetry. The scene of the poem is independent of all time and space. The poet not only created his characters, but the very ground on which they stand. He had nothing to do with either history or geography, the whole realm of imagination was his theatre of action; and in it he shows us the same things, as a concave glass gives back every speck and blemish and unhappy expression, magnified, yet not untrue; exaggerated, but by that means more easily studied.

Shakespeare, the greatest genius the world ever produced, is by far the grandest name in the history of the English drama, and the grandest in that of the poetry of all ages. Immeasurably greater as he was than all the literary men of his age, it is remarkable how little we know of his life. We know not even where he was educated, but the generally received opinion is, that he attended the grammar school in his native town. However and wherever educated, the mind of Shakespeare became filled with an abundance of very varied knowledge.

At the age of twenty-two he went to London, and took the profession of an actor, and as such his career as a dramatist began with the work of remodeling the best plays that the stage afforded. When the ease and success with which he remodeled the work of others suggested to him the design to make his own plays, he did so, and immediately received the reputation of a dramatist. He was essentially the poet of nature. He studied and admired all her laws alike, the simplest and the most mysterious. In the general invention of character of all kinds, there has never been even an approximation to him in the history of the drama. "He has all the smiles as well as tears of nature, and discerns the soul of goodness in things evil."

These three great names are the exponents of the three great transition periods of the English language and literature. In them are found the morning dawn, the day, and the noontide glory of its history. Whatever has followed them, vast and important as it may be, is neither fairer nor better. Religion, philosophy, science and poetry have brought their contributions, and have added many bright names only to enrich its beauties and to extend its roll of honor.

The splendid essays of Bacon, the *Paradise Lost* of Milton, the poems of Dryden, the theological writings of Hooker, Jeremy Taylor and Barrow; the dramatic characters of rare Ben Jonson,

the *Hudibras* of Butler, and the *Pilgrim's Progress* of John Bunyan, are set as diamonds, and will live as long as the language lives in which they were written. We still feel the influence of the philosophy of Locke, the elegance of Pope, the wit of Swift, and the profusion of style and abounding beauties of Addison. Wherever English history is studied, there the names of Hume, Macaulay and Bancroft glitter and gleam as classics jeweled and rimmed with beauty.

The sweet muse of Cowper, and Thompson's vernal songs; the wonderful romances of Walter Scott, and the bright life pictures of Washington Irving, please and delight. Burns, who sang the *Mountain Daisy*; and Byron, who seemed to stoop to touch the loftiest thought; Moore, the lyric poet; great Wordsworth, Tennyson, Longfellow and Bryant, have helped to shape and tune our language to classic lore, and in it crystalized many and many a beautiful theme. And here we might cease our enumeration of objects so fair and good. To some it may seem sufficient. To us it does not. For there still remains one classic, a classic that belongs to all literary languages of our day, and therefore of a necessity to the English. I mean the Bible. In it the emotional, expressional, completeness of form and beauty are found in perfection. In it is the saddest, loftiest thought; the sweetest, purest diction; subjects for all ages and all people. Rich in wisdom, abounding in beauty, fresh and fragrant as a garden of roses, for all time and until eternity, it shall stand first of the classics.

We have thus tripped among the flowers of English classics, and have gathered some of the rarest and brightest. May the fragrance of their sweet memories remain and abide with us forever.

A. M. TICE.

---

COMMENCEMENT WEEK proved, in every particular, a grand occasion for Ursinus College and its many devoted friends, who gathered in large numbers from every direction to participate in the festivities. To gratify the wishes of the still larger number who desired to be present, but could not, as full an account is given of



the events of the week, as our time and space permit in this number of the *Monthly*.

Starting with *Sunday evening*, June 21st, the whole occasion was opened with a special service in the new chapel. In connection with appropriate devotional service, the *Baccalaureate Sermon* was preached by the President, who took for his text Cor. 16: 13, "*Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.*" The theme, of course, was *Christian steadfastness and strength*. The hall was well filled, and the service appeared to be acceptable and impressive. Subsequently, the class about to graduate, to whom the lessons and counsel of the sermon were more directly addressed, asked for its publication. It may be looked for in the August number of the *Monthly*.

On *Tuesday evening* an unexpectedly large number of members of the *Ursinus Union* arrived to attend the preparatory meeting of the Union, and mature the reports of the several standing committees or departments of action. This first meeting already indicated plainly that the manifestation of interest in the institution, its principles and its aims, would exceed even the demonstration of last year.

Each train on *Wednesday* brought additional visitors, until by night a strong regiment had arrived. At 8:30 a. m., another meeting of the *Union* was held to hear the reports of the several committees, and to discuss such matters of interest as were submitted for consideration, the Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D., of Lebanon, President of the Union, being in the chair, and the Rev. W. D. C. Rodrock acting as Secretary. (The Constitution of the Union may be found on another page.)

In the departments of *Publication*, *Church aid*, and *Educational aid*, effective work had been done by the respective committees.

Under the first, arrangements were consummated by which, virtually, a weekly paper was secured in the *Eastern Department* of the "*Christian World*," to represent the cause of Evangelical Reformed principles (in opposition to the Mercersburg-Lancaster movements) in our section of the church. As the readers of the *Monthly* know from our recommendatory announcement at the time, this matter is under the editorial control of the Rev. S. H. Reid, of Huntingdon. It merits the liberal patronage and cordial coöperation of all the friends of the cause. The Rev. W. H. H. Hibshman is the chairman of the standing committee of this

department of our work. To relieve the editor of the "*Reformed Church Monthly*" of part of the burden and responsibility hitherto resting wholly upon him, *Elder Jno. H. Pearsol*, of the "*Lancaster Express*," was chosen *business manager* of the periodical, upon such conditions as might be agreed upon between himself and the editor.

In the next department, Rev. Dr. F. W. Kremer, of Lebanon, chairman, successful measures were devised and carried out for aiding feeble charges and congregations in supporting the ministry, several hundred dollars having been raised and distributed for this purpose, and many pastors and congregations appealed to and enlisted in the work.

The *Educational Aid*, (Beneficiary education,) of which the Rev. George Wolff, D.D., of Myerstown, is chairman, has been especially encouraged in its efforts. More than \$1,800 was contributed to the cause during the past collegiate year, an amount nearly double that obtained during the previous year. In considering this subject, the liveliest interest was shown by all the friends of the Union present. It was stated that there are now *thirty-one* young men connected with the college who have the ministry in view. Of these, *fourteen* are assisted by the department. As the usual allowance is \$200 a year, each, by necessary expenses \$2,800 will be required during the next year by the department, besides an additional sum to meet arrearages. Proper and prompt action was taken to meet the case, and assurances were given which warrant the hope that what is needed will be obtained.

Under the *College Aid Department*, Rev. Dr. E. H. Nevin, of Philadelphia, chairman, interesting discussions were elicited by statements regarding the success of the institution and its bright prospects. The remarkable fact that the college was so well sustaining itself, by largely meeting current expenses by its current income from tuition, &c., both surprised and cheered all present. It was felt that a school which, under the favor of the Lord, so energetically helped itself, deserved to be helped. The claims of the college to be provided with a property and such building accommodations as are required, were admitted, and measures were proposed and adopted to secure this end. It was felt that Ursinus College should not be expected to pay rent, or its equivalent, besides doing what no other similar institution in the coun-



try even attempts to do. It is true that the real estate (or property) debt of the college is \$2,000 less than it was a year ago, notwithstanding increased current expenses, and the stringency of the times. But the friends thought that there should be no debt at all, and resolved that by another annual meeting of the *Union* all its liabilities should be cancelled. An efficient special committee was appointed to secure this important object.

Upwards of sixty new members were added to the *Union*. Altogether, the proceedings and results of this meeting were earnest, animated, and important, demonstrating clearly the wisdom of organizing it, and its great power for most desirable practical ends.

The officers for the present year are: *President*, Rev. Jacob Sechler, of Hanover; *Vice President*, Jno. H. Pearsol, esq., of Lancaster; *Secretary*, Rev. H. A. Keyser, of Mahanoy City; *Treasurer*, Charles Denues, esq., of Lancaster.

The Secretary having been summoned home by a telegram, the Rev. W. H. H. Hibshman was chosen Secretary *pro tem*.

Among those who took part in the various discussions, and contributed interest to the meetings, were the Rev. J. S. Weiss, Rev. Eli Keller, Immanuel M. Kelker, Elders J. M. Follmer, of Watsonstown; Levi Balliet, of Milton; Rev. A. B. Shenkel, Rev. A. G. Dole, Elder J. Wiest, and many others.

Numerous messages and letters of regret at inability to attend the meeting of the *Union* and the exercises, were received, but only the following from the Rev. Dr. Ziegler, of York, can be published, as a fair specimen of the deep interest felt, and as a specimen of the rest:

YORK, PA., June 19, 1874.

*Dear Brother*: I have to regret that bodily infirmities deprive me of the pleasure of being present at the Third Annual Commencement of Ursinus College, on the 25th instant, and the first annual meeting of our Ursinus *Union*.

I cannot fail, however, to communicate to you the assurance of the deep interest which I take in the institution at Freeland, my congratulations upon the measure of prosperity it has already experienced, and my best wishes for its complete success.

Please tell the brethren present at the approaching meeting of the "*Ursinus Union*," that although prevented from meeting with them in person, I shall be with them in spirit, earnestly invoking the blessing of heaven upon the measures they may adopt in furtherance of the cause in which we are engaged.

With best wishes for your own individual welfare, and that of the institution over which you preside, I remain,

Yours truly and sincerely,

DANIEL ZIEGLER.

At one of the meetings of the Union a resolution was passed warmly recommending Dr. Schneck's book exposing the anti-Protestant and anti-Reformed doctrines of the Mercersburg-Lancaster theology, and the following paper in regard to his lamented death was subsequently adopted :

WHEREAS, The All-wise Ruler of the universe, in His infinite wisdom removed from our midst by death Rev. Dr. B. S. Schneck, who was widely known and universally esteemed in the Reformed church as a faithful adherent to the doctrines and usages of the church as they were handed down to us by the fathers of the Reformed church; therefore,

*Resolved*, That as members of the Ursinus Union, we feel deeply bereaved in the death of Rev. B. S. Schneck, D.D., not only because we have lost an honored and genial friend, but because the church of which he was a devoted member and zealous preacher, has been deprived of one of her most useful and revered sons, and the cause of truth of an able and earnest advocate.

*Resolved*, That we gratefully acknowledge the wisdom and goodness of God in allowing our departed brother to prepare and have published shortly before his death a work in which he so earnestly contends for the faith and principles of our beloved church, and which we regard as a rich and precious legacy.

*Resolved*, That we deeply sympathize with the widow and other relatives of the deceased, and that the Secretary be directed to furnish them a copy of these proceedings.

CHARLES DENUES,  
F. W. KREMER, D.D.,  
J. M. FOLLMER,  
I. M. KELKER,

*Committee.*

Whilst the *Union* was engaged in one part of the building, the *Board of Directors* held their annual meeting in another room, *H. W. Kratz, Esq.*, of Trappe, Pa., and *Mr. F. M. Hobson*, of Freeland, the Secretary and Treasurer of the Board being at their posts. The several reports submitted exhibited the prosperous condition of the college in all its departments. That of the Treasurer was felt, of course, to possess special importance in a financial view. It showed that whilst the debt resting upon the property was an incumbrance of which the institution should be promptly relieved, the flourishing condition of the college in other respects furnished a most encouraging motive to its friends to contribute liberally towards affording this relief. During sev-



eral months of the past year the Rev. W. D. C. Rodrock, now pastor of the Upper Mt. Bethel charge, was employed as agent for the college, and notwithstanding the fact that his efforts were made at a time when the whole country was disheartened by great financial difficulties, he met with a fair measure of success.

More fully to provide for the wants of the *Theological Department*, it was formally organized as follows :

Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D., Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology, Symbolics and Exegesis.

Rev. H. W. Super, D.D., Professor of Church History, Biblical Literature and Homiletics.

Levi J. Van Haagen, A. M., Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature.

As this arrangement required additional force in the college department proper, *Philip Williard, A.M.*, was elected Professor of Mathematics. Mr. Williard graduated at Jefferson College some years ago with the highest standing for scholarship, took subsequently a theological course at Mercersburg, and was duly licensed to preach the Gospel. Providentially prevented from entering upon the active duties of the ministry, he engaged for several years in teaching, and with marked success. He was compelled, however, by continued feeble health, to relinquish teaching and engage in some more active pursuit. For ten years he has been connected with the Eureka Mining Company of Northumberland county, and has rendered such efficient service there that he is considered indispensable to its operations. But having fully repaired his health, and feeling that his mission points in another direction, he desires to dissolve his connection with the Eureka Company as soon as he can be released. It is the confident hope of the Board of Directors of the college, that he will see his way clear to accept of the chair offered to him, and thus add his qualifications to the efficient corps of instructors now serving the institution. Professor Super will retain Analytical Mechanics, Astronomy and Cosmogony, and Prof. Williard will have charge of the other branches of the mathematics.

A full code of by-laws for the college was reported and adopted, and the usual other business of the board regularly attended to. The degrees conferred will be found below.

On *Wednesday evening* the biennial oration before the Zwinglian and Schaff Literary Societies was delivered by the Rev. D. E.

Klopp, A.M., of Philadelphia. His subject—*Conscience in Education*—was admirably selected, ably treated, and aimed most commendably at making lasting salutary impressions, rather than at oratorical effect. The effort was a happy one, and was warmly appreciated. It will be found in the present number of the *Monthly*, and deserves the careful perusal, especially of all students.

*The Commencement Exercises.*

Thursday, June 25th, 1874, was just such a day, as to the weather, as the most anxious friends of the college could have desired it to be, especially for a Commencement day celebrated amidst the inspiring beauties of nature. It was ushered in by a bright sun, an exhilarating breeze, and music to make old men young, and young men rapturous performed by *Mueller's Cornet Band* of Philadelphia, which was engaged for the occasion.

Promptly at 10:30 A. M., the exercises were opened with prayer by the Rev. D. E. Klopp. The large chapel of the college was crowded, and mostly with visitors from a distance, our friends in the immediate vicinity being in the midst of their first summer harvest, and prudently heeding the proverb which counsels the farmer to "make hay while the sun shines."

Instead of giving our own account, which might be partial, of the manner in which the graduating class acquitted itself, the following report of its performances is copied from the *Lancaster Pa. Express* of June 27:

The Commencement exercises proper began on Sunday evening, the 21st, with a Baccalaureate sermon by the President of the college, whose theme was—"Steadfastness and Strength."

On Thursday, at 10½ A. M., the graduating class, six in number, began the delivery of their addresses; and we must say we have never, even at colleges of much greater age and larger pretensions, heard speeches by young men, who showed not only fine talent, but evinced more careful study on their own part, and illustrated more thorough training in the various departments of the college. If we mistake not, these young men will be an honor to their Alma Mater, and make themselves felt in the walks of life to which they may be called.

The Salutatory—"No Man Lives to Himself," by Moses Peters, of Sagersville, Pa., was a well-written speech, and was delivered with considerable ease of manner.



Dispute—"Immateriality of the Soul," by J. H. Shuford, Newton, N. C. This young man, for sufficient and good reasons, was excused from delivering his address, and permitted to return home at the beginning of the Senior vacation.

Dissertation—"Liberal Education," by M. H. Groh, Myerstown, Pa. This subject was handled with the skill of an older mind. The delivery was natural, and the speaker bids fair for the future.

Oration—"The English Classics," by A. M. Tice, Myerstown, Pa., proved the writer to be well acquainted with the material of his subject, and was very happy in the selection of those whose works are adapted to illustrate this part of a liberal education.

Philosophic Oration—Subject: "History Viewed Philosophically," by J. G. Neff, Kutztown, Pa. This effort was a masterpiece, exhibiting the highest order of talent and most careful training. This gentleman proved himself very familiar with the nature of his subject. It was well written and effectively delivered.

Valedictory—"What Am I?" by A. E. Dahlman, Philadelphia, was a production of considerable merit, and reflects great credit on the speaker and the college.

Next to the orations of the class followed the conferring of the degree of A. B. (Bachelor of Arts) upon the members of the class, and a brief closing address of counsel and encouragement by the President of the college.

#### *An Interruption.*

At this point an unusual *interruption* of the exercises occurred. The President was proceeding to announce the *honorary* degrees which had been conferred by the Board of Directors, when the Rev. George Wolff, (who was then, yet, merely brother Wolff,) of Myerstown, rose from his seat on the platform, and pushing forward somewhat abruptly, claimed the floor. Knowing him to be a man of order and discretion, the President yielded to the good brother, though rather reluctantly, under the fear that he was possibly carried away by some momentary impulse to move an appeal to the large assembly on behalf of the college, or to offer some resolution expressive of the great gratification felt at the exercises of the hour. It soon became evident that he was speaking with premeditation, and aiming at some preconcerted object.

But for a good while, (his speech seemed a full half hour long,) our closest attention to what he said failed to make out what might be the upshot of it all. And it was not until a moment before he closed, his remarks suddenly took a personal turn, and he stretched forth a hand containing a small paper box, and a "short but thick" scroll, that the "objective point" of the interruption was *ourself*. In a word, it was a presentation of a magnificent *gold chronometer watch*, and \$355 in money. This valuable, double gift, was presented in the name of a large number of warm friends of the cause and evangelical principles of the Reformed church, as distinguished from the Mercersburg-Lancaster scheme, and efforts to use the church as a means of establishing and furthering an opposite theory of Christianity, essentially Popish in its character and system. The presentation was declared to be an expression of the firm devotion of those friends to the evangelical doctrines and customs of the Reformed church, of their cordial sympathy with the maintenance and defence of our Christian church against attempts to revolutionize it, and of their determination resolutely to stand by all proper measures for thwarting such attempts, and for preserving inviolable our Protestant faith and practice. Explicit statements to this effect were made by the brother who acted as spokesman on this occasion. Valuable, therefore, as the gift was in itself, and most thankfully as the expression of great personal regard conveyed through it was appreciated, it was most precious as an emphatic testimonial of abiding faith in the cause thus honored, of a hearty endorsement of services rendered in the maintenance of that cause, of a resolute purpose to cling to it to the end, and of the fullest confidence in its ultimate success.

For ourselves we can say that, in the most literal sense, the pleasant demonstration took us wholly by surprise. A slight intimation had been received two or three days previously from a brother in Philadelphia, which awakened a grateful suspicion that some of our old Race-street friends contemplated a little surprise in the form of some small token of their abiding regard. But beyond the vision of some handsome volume, or photograph album, or something of that sort, no dream of what was placed in our hands had entered our mind.

When Brother Wolff's part of "the performance" was over, a response was of course expected, and had, naturally, to be made.



We have a confused remembrance of having confusedly said something expressive of astonished gratitude, and of being most deeply affected by the assurance given of earnest interest in the work to which, according to ability, our life was devoted, and some kindred points—but it is simply impossible for us to recall definitely either what was said or how it was expressed. Since the occasion, however, there has been time more fully to realize its true import, and to appreciate its significance. It furnishes a theme which is entitled to more space than can be given to it in the present number of the Monthly. *For the present*, therefore, we must content ourselves with again returning our sincerest thanks to the many kind friends whose hearts prompted this substantial token of their Christian esteem, and with assuring them that the longer we think of what they so generously did, the more profoundly do we realize the moral as well as material value of the act. A heart cheered by such a testimonial of approval, confidence and love, may well take courage and feel inspired with fresh zeal; and hands upheld by so many true and devoted friends of a good cause, may well be strengthened for whatever work yet remains to be done.

#### *Honorary Degrees.*

The "presentation" over, the order of the day was resumed by announcing that the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity had been conferred upon the following gentlemen:

*Rev. Nicholas Gehr*, of Zion's Reformed church, Philadelphia.

*Rev. J. G. Wiehle*, of Salem Reformed church, Philadelphia.

*Rev. Isaac H. Reiter*, of the First Reformed church of Miamisburg, Ohio, and the *Stated Clerk* of the General Synod; and

*Rev. George Wolff*, of the Reformed church of Myerstown, Pa.

This last announcement was received with special acclamations by the audience. It was as unexpected to the good brother as his "assault" on us had been, and served as a *reprisal* for his part in the preceding event.

After some notices given, and a general invitation to the evening levee and collation at the house of the President, the exercises were closed with the benediction by the *Rev. Dr. Wolff*.

At 3 p. m. the *Ursinus Union* reassembled for its most interesting and important meeting. The chief items in its proceedings have been already reported. After two hours deliberations the

Union adjourned. All present manifested the most zealous interest in the important objects of the Union, and separated full of encouragement and hope, and resolved to labor with greater ardor than ever for the blessed cause so dear to every heart.

*The Evening Festivities*

At the house of the President, and on the lawn attached to it, appeared to be highly enjoyed by all who favored the invitation to participate in them. At least two hundred guests were present, including the Faculty and students of the college, the graduating class, Alumni, directors of the college, and friends in general. During the collation a new surprise overtook us. Mr. A. L. Kaub having called the company to order, turned toward the host and said that he had been commissioned as superintendent of the *Race Street Reformed Sunday-school*, to convey their cordial salutations, and, as a "slight token" of their cherished affection, to present the contents of an envelope which he then handed to the host. The presentation was accompanied with some exceedingly kind and cheering remarks, very flatteringly made. The gift, and still more the kind words, are thankfully remembered, although an excussable modesty forbids our publishing them.

On opening the envelope, it was found to contain a check for fifty dollars.

The company dispersed about half past eleven, and seem to have gotten through the occasion very delightfully, without the fictitious aid of a doubtful dance or hop.

Thus ended the third annual commencement of Ursinus college, the second at which a class had been graduated, which had completed a full academic course. It was a season of pure festivity, a joyous reunion of many friends of the momentous interests represented by the institution. And the happy influence of the entire occasion promises to secure the most desirable results. There was but one heart and one soul among all whom the commencement had drawn together, and they naturally cheered each other by their encouraging reports, prudent counsels, and earnest pledges of faithful cōoperation in the prosecution of the work undertaken.

On Friday morning our numerous friends started in crowded trains for their homes, bearing with them, as they assured us, most pleasant impressions of the two days spent at Ursinus, and



and resolved, by the favor of the Lord, to repeat their visit another year, and to bring many more with them.

It is due to the proprietor of Prospect Terrace to add, that all his guests were gratified with the accommodations afforded by his house and delightful grounds.

*The Annual Commencement of Heidelberg College, at Tiffin, Ohio,* took place during the week commencing with Sunday, June 7th. On the evening of that day, the Baccalaureate Sermon was preached by the *Rev. G. W. Williard, D.D.*, president of the college. It is reported as a discourse marked with earnest Christian counsel, highly appreciated, and calculated to make the most salutary impressions.

On Monday evening the popular poet, *Will Carleton*, of Hillsdale, Mich., substituting by mutual consent of all concerned, recitations of some of his favorite poems for the previously appointed address before the literary societies.

The annual address before the Alumni Association was delivered on Tuesday evening by the *Rev. S. N. L. Kessler*, of Ross-ville, Ind. His theme, "The Mission of American Scholarship," indicated a clear perception of the true character and demands of the occasion, and excellent judgment in selecting a subject. The correspondent of the *Christian World*, from whose report of the commencement we are culling our facts, says of the address: "After paying a beautiful and appropriate tribute to our country's greatness, her unbounded resources and immense advantages, he glanced at the progress made by it during the past hundred years, in rearing colleges and seminaries of learning, which have sent, and are still sending forth, annually, their scores of men fitted by education and talents to fill important places in the great work of advancing civilization, and so contribute to the prosperity of the American Republic. This he regarded as the true mission of the American scholar. But in order to carry out this mission he must not be a *learned* man, merely, in the too common sense of that term; he must be preëminently a *Christian* scholar, enlightened by the truth, and imbued with the spirit of the great teacher, Jesus Christ, who alone is truth. The American Republic was founded upon Christian principles, and upon those alone can it be perpetuated." Sound and sensible as we infer from this sketch the address must have been, and delivered in the orator's animated style, we can well understand that it was "well received."

The *Commencement exercises* proper were celebrated on the following day, in *National Hall*, which was crowded with a highly "intelligent audience." The citizens of Tiffin manifested the liveliest interest in the great occasion. After the opening prayer by the Rev. Mr. Kessler, essays and orations were read and pronounced by the graduating class in the following order: Salutatory, subject, "Religion an Essential Element in Education," by Miss Jessie Jelley, of Tiffin; Oration, theme "American Literature" by L. Grossenbaugh, of Canton, Ohio; Oration, "Goethe and Schiller," by C. F. Kriete, of Waukon, Iowa; Oration, "Philosophy and Life," by C. M. Schaff, of Sandusky, O.; Oration, "Greek Philosophy," by S. Steffens, Lima, O.; Oration, "Modern Skepticism," by A. H. Zartman, Glenford, O.; Valedictory, by Miss Katie Stoner, Fort Seneca, O.; subject, the "Responsibilities of the Educated."

All the graduates acquitted themselves very creditably, giving proof that they had striven to earn the honors of the day with fidelity and success. After the conferring of degrees upon the class, and some closing words of advice and cheer by President Williard, the honorary degrees conferred were announced, and the exercises closed with the benediction.

The following honorary degrees were conferred upon the occasion: That of A. M., in course, upon J. F. Bunn, Esq., Rev. Austin Henry, and J. Calvin Shumaker, Esq., of the class of 1870; and upon Prof. O. A. S. Hursh and Rev. Alvin S. Zerbe, of the class of 1871.

That of D.D. upon the Rev. P. Herbruck, of Canton, O.; Rev. Prof. H. W. Super, of Ursinus College; Rev. W. G. Taylor, Superintendent of the Pennsylvania Institute for Soldiers' Orphans, Beaver Co., Pa.; and Rev. Samuel Mease, Senior Editor of the *Christian World*.

The honorary degree of A.M. upon Rev. T. A. Edwards, Principal of Harmony Academy, Butler Co., Pa.; and that of M.S. on Dr. J. K. Miller, of Berlin, Somerset Co., Pa.

Most cordially do we congratulate our friends of Heidelberg College upon the prosperity of their institution during the past year, and its encouraging prospects for the future.

*Palatinate College*, Myerstown, closed its Academic year with appropriate services, which are reported to have been highly interesting. It would have given us pleasure to publish a brief ac-



count of the occasion, but none has been furnished, and we are unable at the moment to lay hand upon the paper in which a report appeared.

*Franklin and Marshall College*, Lancaster, celebrated its annual Commencement simultaneously with ours. Quite a large class of young gentlemen graduated, and the various exercises connected with the literary festival are represented as having excited enthusiastic interest.

*The Fall Term of Ursinus College will open on Monday, August 31.* Applications for admission should be made in due time.

## EDITORS' DESK.

*A full account of Commencement week at Ursinus College* will be found in the *Repertory* department. Let all read it. Read, also, the telling article of *Utric*, on "Taking to the Water." It fully exposes the trickery of a very specious effort recently made by the Lancaster Theological Faculty. Attention is also asked to the article in reply to Dr. Gerhart's (we presume) latest attempt to extricate himself from his unhappy predicament regarding "that (alleged) false quotation" under which he is trying to escape the exposure of his anti-Reformed doctrine of Baptismal regeneration, and regarding his withholding from the public an essential part of *Dr. Schneck's* letter to him. The more this latter wrong is thought of, and the purpose of the wrong is considered, the worse it appears.

Let only these five points be kept in mind :

1. The "quotation" seized upon so desperately by Dr. Gerhart, was *not* given in the *Monthly* as taken from Dr. Gerhart's tract.
2. But as to the "matter of it," it does set forth what he teaches in the tract. This has been unanswerably proven by "*Heidelberg*" in the *Christian World*, and by the *Monthly*.
3. Dr. Gerhart's charge, therefore, that the "quotation" as to "the matter of it," is false, falls to the ground, and he has put himself in the awkward plight of one strangling in the effort to swallow his own words.
4. *Dr. Schneck*, in his letter to Dr. Gerhart, told him this, substantially, in the most explicit terms, whilst frankly admitting that he (Dr. S.) had made the mistake of attributing the words of the quotation to Dr. Gerhart's tract.
5. Dr. Gerhart has, for a purpose of his own, suppressed all that part of *Dr. Schneck's* letter to him, thus grievously wronging both *Dr. Schneck* and his friends.

*Opposed to Extremes.*—Very often of late we hear of brethren who *define their position* in regard to the controversy in the church, by declaring that they are *opposed to both extremes*. Many, we doubt not, are honest in this ; but of

the honesty of others we are constrained, unpleasant as it is, to have serious doubts. And this for the following reasons :

1. As long as the Nevinite party seemed to sway the field, and to be able to carry matters their own way, those brethren *had nothing to say about being opposed to extremes*. Then all on *that side* was right, and they appeared to rejoice in the prospect that the ritualistic movement and its false, anti-Reformed theology, would soon sit sovereign over the church.

2. The brethren referred to have *always acted and voted straight-out with the Nevinite party, through thick and thin*, through right and wrong. They did so at Dayton, in 1866 ; at Baltimore, in 1867, in a most bitter proceeding against the Myerstown Convention and all who attended it ; in Hagerstown, in 1868, in a case in which the less said the better for the credit of that Synod and the honor of the church, and especially for the reputation of those whose partisan madness at the time bore down not only their conscience, but common decency ; in Dánville in 1869, and at every Synod since to this day.

It is rather strange, certainly, that those who avow *opposition to both extremes*, should always vote persistently on one side, and give the high-church ritualistic party the constant aid and influence of their votes and sympathy. Can they wonder if their avowals of being *opposed to extremes* are regarded with suspicion, and are not thought truly sincere ?

3. But once more, the professedly neutral and impartial position taken by the brethren in view, assumes what is incorrect and unjust in the premises. They impliedly charge those who are withstanding the Romanizing innovations of Lancaster, (or the Mercersburg-Lancaster party) with going into as hurtful extremes on the other side ; for this, evidently, is the impression they wish to make. The *extremes* they mean do not concern the *manner* in which the controversy is conducted, but the *matter* of it, the views, doctrines, etc., involved. And what they desire to persuade others to believe is, that if Nevinism (in one word) has run into objectionable extremes in one direction, the open opponents of Nevinism have run into and are advocating no less objectionable extremes on the other side.

Now we unqualifiedly deny this charge. We challenge any sufficient proof of it. Six volumes and a half of the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY are before the church. That periodical will doubtless be acknowledged as a most unreserved exponent of the position of those who are arrayed against the new order scheme, and as having furnished ample means of ascertaining the objects for which it has been contending. And we have often defied those charging our side with being extreme, to point out a single doctrine, or principle, or practice, which, judged by the only proper standard, can be justly characterized as extreme. We are extremely averse to the Romanizing, anti-Reformed tenets of Nevinism. This we frankly admit ; but it is because Nevinism is in extreme antagonism to the genius, spirit, historical faith and practice of our Reformed Protestantism. We are extremely averse to the aid and comfort which Lancaster-Mercersburg has given to Popery, and to its having led so many of our ministers and members to apostatize to Popery. On this and similar points we have nothing to conceal.



But if to occupy this position lays us open to the accusation that we are extremists, then the Heidelberg Catechism, and its oldest and most honored expounders, and all the past generations of our Evangelical Reformed ministers, are and were extremists.

This is, or might be, well known by the brethren who now would bring discredit on our efforts against Nevinism by charging us with extremism. It looks as though their real design was to come to the rescue of a sinking cause by exciting unwarranted prejudice against the opponents of that cause. And they must pardon us for saying that, under the circumstances, their declarations of *opposition to both extremes* can hardly be accepted as ingenuous or sincere. Let them frankly state the *extremes* to which they avow themselves opposed.

Meanwhile, it behooves the friends of our old Reformed faith to guard against being blinded or misled by any such declarations of impartial neutrality.

As Dr. Ebrard's alleged views continues to be matters of remark, and misuse, by our Lancaster friends, our notice of the subject will be postponed until they seem to have quite done with their "quotations."

A recent meeting of the (high-church) Lutheran Synod at Lancaster, was attended by the Rev. Dr. Gerhart, in some official capacity, we believe. Availing himself of a congenial opportunity, he is reported as having made a very notable address, setting forth the very intimate relationship in doctrine and cultus, between the section of the Lutheran church represented by that Synod, and the portion of the Reformed church there represented by himself. The address was wholly in the spirit of Dr. T. G. Apple's declaration, noticed some time ago in the *Monthly*, of cordial confessional sympathy with the (ultra) Lutheranism of Prof. Fritschel, of Iowa. Specimens of this address of Dr. G., with some appropriate notes, may be expected in our *August number*.

*Special Notice.*

At our earnest suggestion, relief has been provided for our work in the business department of the "*Reformed Church Monthly*." Hereafter, dues on the *Monthly* are to be paid directly to Jno. H. Pearsol, Lancaster, Pa., who kindly assented to the action of the *Ursinus Union* regarding this matter, appointing him *Business Manager*. Meanwhile, our relations to the *Monthly* continue as heretofore. In connection with other duties, relief was needed from a part of the work involved in conducting such a periodical, which was onerous to us, and could be much better attended to by one so experienced in business as our friend and brother Pearsol. Subscribers will, therefore, please remember to make their remittances to

JNO. H. PEARSOL,  
Lancaster, Pa.

## BOOK NOTICES.

FROM *Scribner, Armstrong & Co.*, 654 Broadway, New York.

"*Forgiveness and Law, grounded in principles interpreted by human analogies.*" By Horace Bushnell.

True historical Christianity, and its divinely revealed faith, have, from the

beginning, been assailed and troubled by two classes of professing disciples and friends, respectively represented in this country by such men as Horace Bushnell and John W. Nevin; in England, by F. W. Robertson and Pusey; and in Germany by Daniel Shenkel and the ultra-Lutheran Löbe. In many important details, the two classes differ from each other, and seem to be even antagonistic. This holds especially true of their contrary views of ecclesiasticism and cultus. But under all such diversities, there is a deeper agreement between them in their common aversion and opposition to the faith as once delivered to the saints, or to the simple, spiritual worship of the primitive church as instituted and commended by the inspired apostles, or to the free presbyterial organization of the church originally established, or to all these things together. They are *broad* churchmen, so liberal in their theology as to allow a full margin to a Colenso, a Huxley, or a J. Stuart Mill. They are high-churchmen, so extreme as to be in cordial fellowship with Popery. Indeed, they seem to be anything, and willing to be regarded as anything, excepting Evangelical Protestants. They can speak blandly of modern "oppositions, of science falsely so-called." They can write very tenderly of things peculiar to the Romish church, unless, perhaps, the recently announced infallibility dogma somewhat offend them. But if there is one thing with which they have less patience, and can speak or write more intolerantly than another, it is evangelical orthodoxy. Against that and its leading advocates, they are ever ready to turn their sharpest weapons, and to deal their heaviest blows.

For all this there are, of course, reasons, varying with the constitutional character and peculiar training and circumstances of the men. Those special reasons need not be now assigned or analyzed. But tracing such special reasons back and down to what may be their common root, that root will be found, we think, to be a root of bitterness, whose essential quality is a pride of intellect, which is unwilling to accept of Gospel truth, as plainly revealed, and of the Gospel scheme of salvation and growth in grace as most clearly set forth in the Scriptures.

"Vain man would be wise (above what is 'written,') though he be born as an ass's colt." This, combined with the growing selfish ambition of an arrogant hierarchy, serves to account for the rise and spread of Popery. This is the generally admitted source of the various grosser heresies which darkened the faith of the early church during the third, fourth and fifth centuries and gradually prepare the way for that long ecclesiastical eclipse which shrouded Christianity in the deepest gloom for ten centuries preceding the reformation. It was the same period during which all minor heresies had become absorbed and consolidated in the vast and comprehensive heresy of Rome.

Men are not satisfied with God's truth. His thoughts and His ways fail to justify themselves to their human reason, or to their human sense of right. So they set themselves to searching after schemes and theories better suited to their own standard of equity and truth. Of course they succeeded, at least, perhaps, to their own satisfaction. Unhappily, what they find, or think they have found, is only one among the hundreds of idle speculations of restive minds which, like its



predecessors, may have its summer's day of fluttering in the breeze, and then fold its frail wings and die.

Mr. Bushnell's new attempt to undermine and demolish the blessed old doctrines of a vicarious atonement and of justification and pardon through Jesus Christ as our sacrificial propitiation, seems to our mind to belong to one of the classes indicated above. It is an unwise and hurtful effort to reconcile, possibly his own heart, but at any rate the hearts and minds of skeptics, to the Gospel doctrine of the plan of salvation, by reconstructing, modifying and lowering that doctrine, so as to bring it down to their own theoretical and ethical level.

The whole argument of his book appears to amount to this :

The commonly received doctrine of Evangelical Christianity concerning the way in which sinners may be pardoned, reconciled to God, and saved, contradicts *my* reason and *my* moral sense.

Therefore I reject that doctrine, and offer as a substitute one which is more accordant with my reason, because grounded in what I conceive to be correct principles, interpreted by human analogies.

This book may confirm rejectors of the Gospel way of life in their aversion to Evangelical Christianity ; and it may make some converts to Mr. Bushnell's peculiar method of advocating old errors—just as Puseyism and its imitation in this country have made converts to Rome ; but we do not believe that the book is calculated to lead a single soul to that only Christ offered in the Scriptures as the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world.

The *Bibliotheca Sacra* and Theological Eclectic, for July, comes freighted with its usual supply of excellent articles, all very readable, and some of them full of solid instruction. I. Exegesis of Arts, 26, 28, 29. II. The Unity of our Lord's Discourses, by Dr. F. Gardiner. III. The Natural Foundations of Theology, by Dr. Thomas Hill. IV. Richard Rothe's Ministry in Rome, by Dr. S. Osgood. V. The Force of Certain Hebrew Negative Particles, by Prof. Mead, of Andover. VI. Edmund Burke. VII. A June Day in Jerusalem. VIII. Baptism of Infants and their Church Membership—Modern views. IX. Notices of recent publications. Terms, \$4 a year, in advance. Warren F. Draper, Andover.

*Ninth Annual Catalogue* of Mercersburg College. This institution may be regarded as a revival of Marshall College under a new name on the old ground. From the evidences of prosperity indicated by the Catalogue, its success thus far appears to condemn the removal of Marshall College to Lancaster, and to establish the better claims of the old location.

The Faculty consists of six Professors, aided by three Tutors, with the Rev. E. E. Higbee, D.D., as President. The whole number of students for the year was 101. Connected with the College we find a *Post Graduate Course in Theology*, with the Rev. Dr. Higbee and Rev. J. B. Kerschner, A. M., as Professors. Will Lancaster allow this without a demurrer?

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

REFORMED CHURCH. *Our branch, East.*—*Personal and Congregational* items, are crowded out of the present issue, excepting the sad notice of two more deaths in the ministry, viz :

Rev. Christian Kessler, at Lehighton, on May 26. He was licensed and ordained only two years ago as pastor of St. John's congregation, Reading. His health, however, soon failed, compelling him to relinquish his charge. He was buried in the Reading cemetery.

Licentiate Daniel F. Keller, in Denver, Colorado, during the first week of June. He had gone to Denver, prompted by a true missionary zeal, to devote himself to the service of the Master in that new field for our Church. The particulars of his last illness and death have not been thus far ascertained.

In the *Eastern Department* of the "*Christian World*," for June 18, the action of the Reformed congregation of Jefferson, Md., is referred to in regard to ministers who claim exclusive authority to introduce full liturgical or ritualistic services into the regular Lord's day worship. The congregation, or the consistory for it, asserts its right to a voice in such matters, under the Constitution, and action of the General Synod, and declares that it will not call for its pastor any minister who claims superior prerogatives in the case. In this action the Jefferson church has done only what it had a right to do, and what there was sufficient reason for doing under existing circumstances. We know enough of Reformed people to know that they cherish all due respect for the ministry as a divinely instituted office and agency for the upbuilding and spread of true Christianity; but such respect requires no servile submission of the church (*die Gemeinde*, the people of the Lord as such,) to a ministry which may arrogate special, official, sacerdotal supremacy in any form. Mercersburg-Lancaster notions may favor such pretensions, but they are utterly at variance with the Gospel, and with the Gospel spirit and genius of the Reformed Church.

It would be well if all our congregations would awake to some similar sense and assertion of their Christian constitutional rights. One thing is certain, that if all our congregations who hold the views expressed in the above action understood the situation fully, and would give a like unreserved utterance to their sentiments, the advocates of an opposite theory of the ministry and of the new order movement generally, would become still more thoroughly convinced of their fatal mistake in supposing that they could go quietly forward with their erratic attempts to lead the Reformed Church back again into the bondage of false Romish doctrines, and worse than false semi-Romish ordinances.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—AUGUST, 1874.—No. 8.

---

THE MINORITY REPORT OF 1862.

[As promised, we give below the Report of the Minority of the Liturgical Committee, presented to the (Easton) Synod of Chambersburg, in 1862. It was intended as a brief refutation of the main practical points of the Majority Report, especially of the erroneous and deceptive claim of the majority that they were acting in accordance with instructions. The fact is, that our Church as a whole no sooner discovered the true aim of the party represented by the majority, than it determined to dispose of the entire subject of the Liturgy without delay. This is proven by the defeat of that party at Lebanon in 1860, and at Easton in 1861. That party was opposed to the revision of the Liturgy of 1857 at that time. They knew that if it should be revised, then they would lose their game; so they tried every artifice to have the revision postponed. At Chambersburg, in 1862, they gained their point by a skillfully put motion of *indefinite postponement*. This had the appearance of fair dealing with both sides; but it was in effect a trick which secured to the majority of the Committee just what they wanted—*delay*—in the hope of gaining strength by such delay. It is against this chiefly the Minority Report is aimed. Had the thing aimed at by this Report been secured, it would have saved the Church twelve years of controversy, and many of its unfortunate results.

Three names will be found appended. The lamented *Heiner*, then unable through sickness to attend the Synod, departed in

October, 1863. The Rev. S. R. Fisher, D.D., still lives, but would probably give a great deal if his name were not to the Report, having since then been led, by considerations not hard to discern, to turn his back upon the position then taken. For ourselves, we have only to express regret that the Report is not expressed in stronger terms, and did not even more boldly maintain the only right and safe position.

Instead of adding explanatory notes, readers who may desire to know more about the history of the whole matter, in its details, are referred to our two tracts, entitled "*The Revised Liturgy*," 1866, and "*Reformed not Ritualistic*," (in reply to Dr. Nevin's "Vindication of the Revisited Liturgy.") The two are equal in the amount of matter to about five or six numbers of the MONTHLY, and will be furnished, post-paid, for 75 cts.]

*To the Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States.*

Reverend Fathers and Brethren: The undersigned members of the Committee on the Liturgy, dissenting in important particulars from the views, positions and general tenor and aim of a report adopted by a majority of the members of said Committee, and ordered by them to be presented to your Reverend body—respectfully beg leave to present the following reasons for our earnest dissent from said Report, and to offer, for your consideration and approval, the Provisional Liturgy, with such modifications and changes as we believe have been called for by the expressed wishes of the Church at large, and as we have understood the resolution of the Synod of Easton to instruct the Committee of Revision to make.

It is with reluctance that this course is adopted. Our sincere hope was, that whatever preferences might exist in the minds of some of our esteemed brethren, for an order of worship differing essentially from that ever recognized, and prevailingly practiced by the German Reformed Church, both in Europe and in this country, *all* would agree in making theoretical convictions, or (subjective) personal predilections] yield to ecclesiastical consistency, and the manifest desire and will of the Church. In this hope, however, we have been disappointed. Believing themselves justified in their endeavors to induce the Church to material changes in its entire ritual, changes which involve fundamental principles and doctrines, and the substitution for its old estab-



lished order of worship, of a new one at variance with our ecclesiastical antecedents, and hostile, even, to our ecclesiastical character, they are unwilling to make those changes and modifications in the Provisional Liturgy, which we believe are demanded by the Synod and the Church. Yielding, therefore, to an imperative sense of duty to the Synod and the Church, the undersigned have endeavored, in this separate capacity, to perform the service enjoined by the Synod of Easton upon the Committee. Our aim has been to discharge this delicate office in a plain and frank way, and yet, we trust, without doing the least violence to the intimate fraternal relations we sustain to each other, as members in common of the body of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We shall first of all state our reasons for dissenting from the Report of the majority of the Committee, and thus offer a vindication of the course we have been constrained to take, so far as any such vindication may be needed.

1. We earnestly object to said Report, because we regard it as *a virtual evasion of the duty assigned the Committee by the Synod of Easton, and an actual frustration of the wishes of the Church, in regard to the Provisional Liturgy.*

General and indefinite as the resolution of instructions, passed by the Synod of Easton (see Min. pp. 77-8) may, in some respects be assumed, to be the sense and design of the Synod, in regard to the subject, is set forth with sufficient clearness to have enabled the Committee to proceed with its work. Those instructions call for a "*revision*" of the Provisional Liturgy. They direct the Committee to be governed in that "*revision*" by "*the suggestions of the Classes, as given in the minutes of their late meeting.*" Those suggestions are understood, by the resolution of Synod, to call for modifications and changes in the Provisional Liturgy as shall make it a new work "*not inconsistent either with established liturgical principles and usages, or with the devotional and doctrinal genius of the German Reformed Church.*" And, finally, the instructions assume, that all this may be done without disturbing the true "*unity*" of the work.

We find it difficult to see room for any serious difference of opinion as to the real intention of these Synodical instructions. The obvious key to their meaning and design, is found in the central clause: "*Not inconsistent either with the established liturgical principles and usages, or with the devotional and doctrinal*

*genius of the German Reformed Church."* That by "*established liturgical principles and usages*" are meant such as the German Reformed Church may recognize and allow, will hardly be disputed, and can scarcely require proof. If such only are not meant, it would indeed be impracticable for the Committee to determine by what rule to proceed with the work of revision. Different ecclesiastical systems assume correspondingly different "*liturgical principles and usages.*" The Greek Church has those peculiar to its views of propriety; the Romish Church, those which it thinks best; the Irvingites have theirs; the Episcopal Church, those which it conceives to be well authenticated; whilst non-ritualistic churches, rejecting the use of written forms, honestly believe that theirs are in the most real harmony with the true Apostolic and primitive idea and practice of Christian worship. No less impracticable would it be for the Committee to proceed with their work, if the resolution of Synod were supposed to mean "*principles and usages*" established in some particular period of the Christian Church, say in the fourth or fifth centuries. For, apart from the difficulty of ascertaining, indubitably, what the "*principles and usages*" of such a period were, there would be room for serious differences of opinion as to which age should be allowed the right of determining them, and dictating their unquestioning adoption to the church of all future times. And it might be most especially debatable whether such authoritative influence should be conceded to an age notoriously corrupted, in its dogmas and ritual, by pernicious heresies and scandalous admixtures of superstitious ceremonies with its public worship.

The meaning, therefore, of the phrase in question, we have held to be unequivocal. Synod thereby indicated "*principles and usages,*" the force and authority of which are recognized by the Reformed Church, especially by our branch of the Reformed Church.

This sense seems, also, to be definitely fixed by the next clause: "*the devotional and doctrinal genius of the German Reformed Church.*" This clause is clearly designed to qualify that with which it is so closely connected, and which immediately precedes it. Not *any* established "*principles and usages*" were to be the rule by which the Committee should be guided in the work of revision. Synod is more guarded; is too well aware of the uncertain latitude which so broad a margin might give. It is therefore



wisely added : "or with the devotional and doctrinal genius of the German Reformed Church." Whether this disjunctive "or" was meant to indicate a parallel between the two clauses—as though the latter were substantially a synonym of the former—or not, does not affect the true import of the language. Whatever was done, should be done in harmony, with such "established liturgical principles and usages" as are in harmony "with the devotional and doctrinal genius of the German Reformed Church."

Convinced of the correctness of this interpretation of the instructions of the Synod of Easton, we object to the Majority Report, because it is a virtual evasion of a plainly prescribed duty. To what extent that Report itself admits such an evasion and betrays a determination not to allow any changes to be made in the Provisional Liturgy, which the majority deems incompatible with the integrity of the book, or prejudicial to its literary excellence, no matter how strongly such changes may be demanded, the Synod is well able to gather from the document itself. We let it bear its own unpleasant testimony on this point.

But in refusing to comply with what we believe to be the instructions of Synod, the Report of the majority is open to the no less serious objection of frustrating the wishes of the Church at large. We believe, that so far as our Church has given attention to the recent Liturgical movement, it has made up its mind on the subject. And although the actions of some of the Classes may not be so much an exponent of the views and desires of the churches within their bounds, as of the individual ministers and elders constituting those bodies, still we think the resolutions passed by them, indicate with sufficient clearness what is asked for and demanded in the circumstances. The Church, if we have rightly understood her voice, is opposed to any radical changes in our mode of public worship, and desires only that her proper usages and customs be restored, and that the requisite forms for such restoration, with such modifications or improvements as may be made, in full harmony with their spirit and principles, be provided. And it is further desired, that this be done with the least possible delay. This desire, it was hoped, was on the eve of being realized, and the present Synod was expected to take some final action in the case. The Report of the majority frustrates this earnest and just expectation. Its adoption could not fail to cause an indefinite postponement of the whole subject. It would leave

the Church in greater perplexity than ever, and open the way for endless confusion.

2. We furthermore object to the Report, because *is is not such a paper as we think was called for, by the action of the Committee at its meeting in Lancaster.* The resolution of the Committee, calling for the preparation of a Report (see Majority's printed Report, Prefatory Notice) contemplated such an exhibition of the points at issue, as would fairly set forth the merits of both schemes of worship. It was to be an impartial document, definitely presenting all the facts in the case, without pleading for either side. That the Majority's report is not such a paper, is only too palpable. In its pervading tenor and spirit it is a strong, unambiguous testimony against the order, or orders of worship, which the majority dislikes, and an elaborate, unreserved commendation of that order of worship which the Majority prefers. It is, in a word, an ex-parte paper, prepared wholly in the interest of the style of ritualism contended for. No advocate of that mode of worship, by which even the most liturgical portions of our Church have been characterized, would be willing to let that part of the Report which treats of such a Liturgical service, stand as a candid and fair exhibition of its merits. On the other hand, however, the warmest admirers of an extreme ritualism could hardly desire their favorite system of worship to be more attractively portrayed or more ably and eloquently vindicated.

This, we affirm, was not the proper design and intention of the resolution which provided for the preparation of the Report. Had this been the understood aim, that resolution would certainly not have been "unanimously adopted." Inasmuch, therefore, as the Report fails, in this respect, to meet its proper design, and wholly transcends the purpose it was intended to serve, we are compelled most emphatically to dissent from it, and to object to its adoption.

3. A third objection we raise against the Report is, that it not only fails to do what Synod directed, and the Church desired should be done, but that *it attempts to perform a service which we deem antagonistic to the purpose and wishes of the Synod and the Church.* We are willing that the Report shall be interpreted by the most lenient rules, and allowed the full advantage of any saving clauses it may contain. But the most lenient and charitable construction cannot relieve it of the charge of attempting to persuade the



Church to repudiate the principles of its past cultus, to pronounce that cultus inherently wrong, and to adopt an order of worship radically, essentially at variance with, or diverse from, that which belongs to her whole history and life. The unavoidable effect, if not the actual design of the document, must be to produce in the minds of our clergy and laity, a strong dislike of the mode of worship instituted and practiced by our fathers, and even a hearty contempt for customs sanctioned and consecrated by the wisdom and piety of our ecclesiastical ancestors. No one can approvingly read that Report and endorse its arguments, without feeling such aversion, or cherishing such contempt. The very fact that it is as skillful, learned, and logical, as it is admitted to be, for its purpose, only renders it more likely to produce the effect stated.

Did the Synod or the Church desire such an effect to be produced? Can any fair interpretation of the various reports and resolutions adopted by the Synod, from the commencement of the Liturgical movement to the present time, be regarded as in the least favoring such an attempt? That nothing of this sort can be found in any action taken; prior to the Synod of Baltimore, is admitted. It is assumed, however, that the Report of the Committee, adopted by the Synod of Baltimore, in 1852, justifies the course which has been pursued. Against this assumption we must be allowed kindly but earnestly to protest, fully persuaded that nothing of the sort was contemplated. That action did, indeed, allow the Committee, in the preparation of the new Liturgy, to go back of the Reformation period, and appropriate suitable material, so far as it could be found, from earlier centuries. But in doing this, the Committee was to be governed by a ruling regard "for the *old Palatinate* and other *Reformed* Liturgies of the *sixteenth* century." Whatever could be introduced from older rituals, in consonance with the evangelical principles and spirit of those *Reformed* Liturgies, the Committee was allowed to introduce. Beyond this proper limit, however, they were not expected to go. The Committee knew with what aim and purpose the Church had engaged in the work of preparing a new book of forms, viz., that our legitimate mode of worship and customs might be restored to authority again, with such congenial modifications and improvements as change of time and of circumstances might favor. And the Synod of Baltimore did not intend to go back of previous actions, and annul previous plans,

and authorize the Committee to start again upon an entirely new theory of worship. If there were no other evidence of this, the disappointment of the Church with the Provisional Liturgy, her dissatisfaction with some of its peculiarities, and, above all, her refusal to use or admit the use of those peculiarities, abundantly prove the correctness of our view. Those features of the book which the Majority's Report contends were given to it in accordance with the plan approved by the Synod of Baltimore, as the Majority have understood that plan, are precisely the features which render it obnoxious to the Church, and debar its general introduction. A liturgy is wanted. Such a liturgy is desired, also, as may serve to effect greater uniformity in our mode of conducting public worship and promote devotional edification. But the style of worship, and the uniformity desired, are such as will harmonize with our "established liturgical principles and usages," not such as would utterly subvert them. And as the theory of worship advocated and urged by the Majority Report, and exhibited in the offensive peculiarities of the Provisional Liturgy, is subversive of our past principles and usages, even by the admissions of the Report, that theory is disapproved and rejected.

It is evident, therefore, that the Report of the Majority, in holding up to ridicule and condemnation the system of worship which has had the sanction of the German Reformed Church for more than three hundred years, has assumed an ungrateful task, and one which the Synod of Easton did not mean to assign. And it is no less evident that the same Report has gone equally far out of the path of duty, and performed a service neither asked for nor desired, in attempting to advocate a system of worship which it confesses is essentially different from any hitherto approved or practiced by the Reformed Church, and in seeking to persuade the Synod and the Church of the incomparably superior excellence of that system.

For it merits special notice that the Report is not simply a vindication or commendation of the peculiarities of the Provisional Liturgy. It goes much further. In its present form the Provisional Liturgy at least *tolerates free prayer, and some degree of personal liberty in the devotional services of the sanctuary*. But the Report takes far higher ground. It explicitly disapproves of all such subjective libertinism. All the devotions of the sanctuary



must be literally prescribed, and proceed by rote. From first to last the worship must be conducted in the strict use of the forms of the book. No room must be allowed for extemporized platitudes or impromptu ministerial sentimentalities. The sanctity of the place and hour must not be exposed to the profane intrusions of free prayer! This is the theory, this the undeniable purport of the Majority's Report. It does, indeed, not ask the Synod to pronounce, officially, against free prayer, or recommend, positively, the utter immediate exclusion of such prayer from our public worship. But if this Synod should adopt the Report, it would most unquestionably commit itself to the endorsement of a theory of worship which not only excludes, but most emphatically condemns, all free prayer in public worship.

This is not all. As it now stands the Provisional Liturgy allows a *non-responsive* order of worship for the regular Lord's day service. There are two forms of this character in the book. Repudiating this, the Report in question commends and pleads for a responsive and otherwise complicated ceremonial, as the only order of worship which can make any decent pretensions to liturgical propriety. If this Synod should be induced to adopt that Report, therefore, it would fully commit itself to a theory of worship which tolerates none but responsive services.

When, in addition to this, it is discovered that the Report quite unreservedly accuses those of liturgical incapacity who do not fully appreciate or approve of its pleas in favor of an extremely ritualistic cultus, we find reason to be still more deeply grieved at its tenor and aim. Accordingly, we feel ourselves wholly justified in refusing to endorse a paper of that character, and in having endeavored to prepare a report more in accordance with given instructions, and the known wants and wishes of the whole church.

4. The Report of the Majority assumes that the modifications, changes, or amendments said to be demanded, *would destroy the integrity or unity of the Provisional Liturgy, and mar its literary excellence.* Here again we are compelled to join issue with the Report, and to dissent from the course taken. From the first publication of the Provisional Liturgy, it has been allowed and expected, that very important modifications, of at least some portions of the work, would be found necessary, after a fair trial of it. Only by such actual trial of its merit, could its availability

and adaptation to the wants and desires of the Church, be properly ascertained. Even the members of the Committee themselves, could not advisedly judge the real qualities of the work without such a practical test. The impressions received from the reading and critical consideration of the various forms, in the Committee, might be very favorable. But it was impossible to form a correct and final judgment concerning them in this way. It was indispensable that they should be put into actual practice, rubrics and all. This was freely admitted. And it was admitted, too, in a way which implied, that upon such trial, reasons might be discovered for making important changes in the work. But if this was supposed possible in the case even of members of the Committee, how much more likely was it that the Church at large would call for considerable modifications, before consenting to the adoption of the work, as its authorized order of worship?

The book, moreover, *was obviously constructed with a view to the possibility, or probability*, of its undergoing no inconsiderable changes. Its preparation for provisional use, on trial, involves this. This is equally evident from the occurrence of diverse forms in the Lord's day and other services, forms constructed on what the Report pronounces essentially different principles. Between these the Church was to be allowed, was expected, to choose. This right of choice involved, of course, the right of asking for changes, and for such changes as might exclude the responsive features from the devotional part of the book. Who thought that the important modifications, which, it has from the first been conceded might be found necessary, would concern only grammatical construction, logical precision, or beauty of style? And yet, when such alterations are at length demanded, as possess any real, intrinsic importance, loud protests are raised against the demand, on the ground that it assails the unity and threatens the life of the work! There are two Lord's-day forms with responses, and there are two others without responses. Of these the Church was to choose that system of worship it preferred. It prefers the non-responsive forms, and asks that the other two may be excluded, or so amended as to make them harmonize with the rest, and thus *establish* the unity of the book. "You are assailing the unity of the work," is the reply. "It cannot be allowed." The report, be it remembered, pleads for a responsive order of worship, emphatically pronounces such an order, in the



fullest sense, the only one compatible with any rational conception of liturgical propriety, and, especially, wholly incompatible with non-responsive forms. And yet the Provisional Liturgy, the unity of which, it is argued, would be destroyed, or seriously disturbed, by eliminating responses from the devotional forms, really has no such unity, if the argument and tendency of the Report is correct. Nay, more. It was constructed and published, provisionally, expressly on the presumption that the exclusion of such responses might be among the modifications which, on trial of the book, the Church would demand.

We confess our inability to appreciate the consistency of this plea, and must be allowed to object to its validity. If the Synod should adopt the Majority Report, it would endorse an argument, touching this point, again, which would greatly embarrass any subsequent action which might be required in the case. Our hope, therefore, is, that such endorsement will not be given.

The merits of the system of worship so warmly recommended by the Majority Report we deem it unnecessary to discuss, assuming, as we feel warranted in doing, that however great those merits may be made to appear to be, the German Reformed Church has no thought of adopting such radical and revolutionary innovations as the measure would involve. This Synod, and the Church it represents, would not tolerate a proposition to substitute a hierarchical for its presbyterial order of church polity. The question of church polity is presumed to be settled for us. Any attempt to disturb the foundations on which our ecclesiastical fabric is resting, in this respect, would most assuredly, as most justly, be frowned down. A very long, and a very able argument might be constructed, showing the supposed defects, the absurdity and the irrationality of our present organization. It might be exhibited in very ridiculous aspects, and be scarified with keen-eyed sarcasms. But none of those things would move us. Satisfied of the soundness and strength of our ecclesiastical system of government, we would let mockers laugh and foes assail, but still hold fast to what our fathers proved to be so good, and bequeathed as a sacred legacy to their posterity.

The question of evangelical doctrines is, by our Church, presumed to be settled for us. And this Synod would assuredly shrink from any proposition which might be made to reconstruct our dogmas. No objection is made to legitimate developments of

doctrines held, to such developments as may serve more forcibly to exhibit them and more strongly to corroborate them. But we as a Church surely do not care to listen to an argument in favor of Unitarianism, against the orthodox view of the Trinity, and would not afford opportunity for discussion of the subject, with a view to a possible modification of our creed. Not that we would fear argument, but would shun superfluous strifes; not that we would shut out the light, but exclude the darkness of stormy strifes. We know full well what learning and logic can be brought to the support of even such an error. But we have already conquered the error, and would not care to have the battle to fight over again.

In like manner we assume, that the German Reformed Church has no desire to engage, *de novo*, in the discussion of questions touching the various systems of public worship. Among others, the system so ably advocated in the Majority Report may be a very good one, in itself considered. But the Report, with admirable candor, acknowledges that it is not such a system as has ever been known in the Reformed Church. Its adoption would be a radical innovation upon our past principles, practices and usages. We hold, therefore, that it is not a subject which this Synod cares to have discussed, and hence we decline any special consideration of it, confident that this body will approve of our course.

With these preliminary statements, then, we proceed to submit to your approval the Revised Provisional Liturgy. In the revision, we have been governed wholly by the instructions of Synod and the Church, and have endeavored to preserve throughout, the integrity of the book, whilst, at the same time, we have sought to make it harmonize more fully with the usages and doctrines of the German Reformed Church. The greatest change made, will be found in the service for the Lord's Supper, where the form of the Old Palatinate Liturgy, mainly, has been substituted for that of the Provisional Liturgy. There was an incompatibility between the Preparatory service and the Communion service of the Provisional Liturgy, which seemed to demand this substitution. In the Preparatory service the questions and answers of our older service have been substantially restored.

All the devotional responses have been erased. Theoretically, it might have seemed tempting to retain some of them. But the



admission of the principle, even in exceptional cases, seemed to involve serious practical difficulties.

A number of expressions in the forms of Confession, Holy Baptism, Ordination, Confirmation, &c., &c., have been so modified as to make them more accordant with the established doctrines of our Church.

Deeply sensible of the responsibility of our work, we have yet been enabled to do it cheerfully and confidently. We had nothing to originate, but only to carry out plainly expressed instructions. And we felt the more encouraged to go forward by the conviction that if the result furnished the Church with what was needed and desired, and with what would serve to settle the question of Church worship, and the distracting agitations to which it has given rise, our labors will have their reward. We are not insensible to the existence of imperfections in the work as revised. But we believe that they will not be found so many, or of so serious a nature, as to hinder its usefulness. If the book, as now submitted, is substantially what the Church wishes it to be, and if under the blessing of the Lord, it may serve the purposes of promoting a spirit of true devotion, of aiding in the decent and edifying exercise and utterance of such devotion, and of securing greater uniformity throughout our Church in the order of public worship, we may cheerfully adopt it.

Respectfully submitted,

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
ELIAS HEINER,  
SAML. R. FISHER.

---

“THE FAITH.”

It will be remembered that a plain distinction is made in the New Testament between *faith* as a personal act, and the same word as designating that which is believed, or laid hold of, by such personal faith. This two-fold use of such words as faith, hope, joy (abstract words) is common to them as a class. A person may say: My hope is in the Lord; or he may say: The Lord is my hope. In the former case he declares what his personal feeling of reliance is; in the latter he declares that the Lord is the source, ground and substance of his feeling of hope. In like manner St. Paul uses the word *joy* in Gal. v: 22, and Col. i: 11.

All true faith, taking the word in a personal sense, requires; and indeed pr supposes, *something to be believed*. It is impossible to have faith without having something to believe. And this something must be a real truth or fact, *clearly* set forth, and in such a way that no room is left for doubt or uncertainty in regard to it. For personal faith, especially in a Christian or Gospel sense, is an act of the mind and heart more positive, definite, and decided than any other act of which the spirit of man is capable. Hence the Heidelberg Catechism (Quest. 21) defines it as—1, a *certain knowledge*; and 2, an *assured confidence*.

But in order that a person may have such a certain, intelligent and hearty faith in anything, that on which his faith is to be fixed must be definitely made known, and must come to the mind and heart with such evidences of its truth, and with such authority as to leave no room for reasonable doubt or misapprehension. To believe anything, in the proper Gospel sense of believing, you must *first be sure that it is*, and you must then be equally sure as to *what it is*, so far as is necessary to be apprehended.

It is hardly needful to add that this view of the matter is fully sustained by the Scriptures. Indeed, it is mainly derived from the explicit declarations of the Scripture on the subject. Now in full agreement with this, *we find in the Bible a clear statement of every fact and truth belonging essentially to the Christian system*, and which every Christian was required to receive and hold as *his faith*. All these facts and truths taken together were called "*the faith*." It was this faith which the Apostles and those sent forth to preach were commanded to proclaim and to teach. They did this by word of mouth. To make it all still more definite and fixed, it was set down in writing. It was preached or written in the plain common language of the people. Every one was to know it and believe it for himself. Not that each one and all were thought able at once fully and entirely to *understand* all that was thus set forth. But every one could know enough to be able to lay hold of it, and to be saved by it.

This is evident from such passages as the following:

"A great company of the priests were obedient to *the faith*."  
Acts 6 : 7.

"Obedience to the faith." Rom. 1 : 5; 16 : 26.

"Let us prophesy according to *the proportion of (the) faith*."  
Rom. 12 : 6.



"But they heard only that he which persecuted us in times past, now preacheth *the faith*."

"There is \* \* one faith." Eph. 4: 5.

"Men of corrupt mind, reprobate concerning *the faith*."  
2 Tim. 3: 8.

"That they may be sound in *the faith*." Tim. 1: 13; 2: 2.

"*The faith* once delivered to the saints." Jude 3.

From this it follows beyond controversy, first, that there *is* such a *faith*; secondly, that in all essential points it was definitely and authoritatively made known to the primitive Church; and thirdly, that this faith is fixed and permanent, as set forth in the Bible.

It becomes, therefore, an interesting and important inquiry, "*What were the first Christians taught to hold* as the true faith, and what did they hold? To this double inquiry we might naturally expect a distinct answer in the Scriptures. And if we turn to the Scriptures we find the desired answer clearly given.

Let us then turn to them, and gather from them *the faith* of the primitive church. In one view it may be said, this may be learned from what is commonly called *The Apostles' Creed*. But rightly to explain and understand that Creed we must do as our Reformed fathers did, and as, indeed, all true Christians of old times did—namely, take the articles of that Creed in a sense warranted by the Bible. It is well known, and is now generally admitted, that the Apostles' Creed, as we have it, was not made up for four or five hundred years after the times of the Apostles. Especially is it known, that one of the articles of the Creed—"He descended into hell"—was not generally received until about six or seven hundred years after the Apostles' days. In its literal sense it was never received by the Reformed Church, being without Scripture authority. Hence, the virtual setting aside of the article by *Ursinus*, and all Reformed theologians, who explain it as merely a fuller statement of the previous article concerning our Lord's passion on the cross.

The Apostles' Creed, then, cannot be taken as a full exhibition of the faith of the Apostles and of early Christians. Neither may it be considered, properly, as of authority in its own absolute sense, to bind our faith. As an old symbol\* of Christianity it

---

\*There is a popular mistake as to the real antiquity of this symbol. The *Nicene Creed*, as handed down, is more than 200 years older in ecclesiastical authority than the Apostles'.

will always keep its hold on the affections of the church. But rightly to appreciate what was meant by its articles, when the oldest and most authentic of them were first used, they must be studied in the light of the Scriptures, and be taken in a Scriptural sense.

Turning, then, directly to the Scriptures for the purpose of ascertaining "*the faith*" of the Apostles and first Christians, we do not, of course, find the articles of that faith anywhere set down in formal systematic order, in the style of later Creeds. But we find what is better—namely, that the doctrines of grace are presented in such a way as both to bring them more closely home to the heart and conscience which they were mainly intended to reach and work upon, and to make them more plain to the mind or understanding of those to whom they were addressed. And the more carefully we study the New Testament (of course in its inner connection with the Old Testament) for the purpose of learning what *the faith* of the primitive church was, the more will we be surprised at finding so much revealed, and that so clearly revealed, upon the subject. Beginning with the doctrines of God, and His relation to the world, and especially to man, the Gospels and Epistles abound in passages which show clearly what was taught and held concerning man, the fall of man, the covenant of redemption, Christ, His person and His work, repentance, conversion, regeneration, church ordinances, prayer, death, the judgment, hell and heaven.

Believing, therefore, that it will be found especially instructive at this time to refresh our minds in regard to the particular items of "the faith once delivered to the saints," we propose in a short series of articles to gather up and set forth the doctrines of that faith, as stated in Scripture language, and as professed by the Apostles and first Christians. This series may then be followed by another, setting forth the errors which tried to get the upper hand in those primitive times, and against which the Apostles and first believers so faithfully struggled.

Both these series will be found, no doubt, to bear rather hard against the mis-faith of our Lancaster friends. But we cannot help that. If they have departed from the early Apostolic faith, we are not responsible; and if they have fallen into errors like those of Hymeneus and Philetus, they are themselves to blame.



## STRIFE-MAKERS.

Whatever may be the deficiencies of the Professors in Theology at Lancaster, they abound in ability to *call names*. This was, in his palmy days, one of the eminent powers of the great leader of that tendency. All the disciples develop a natural aptitude in that direction. In all their controversial writings, from the "Anxious Bench" down to the last ill-natured article in the *Messenger* for May 20th, this ugly feature protrudes itself. It is a boyish practice, that is usually laid aside when *boys* become *men*. It belongs to rude and uncultivated stages of society, and is usually left behind as men reach a position where its presence is unseemly. But probably these are only spots on the sun, or evidences of human infirmity that it is natural to exhibit in that state of mind which was the misfortune of the writer of the article, "*The Seminary*." Those who have been constrained to resist the introduction of error into the Church, and deplored the bias given Romeward to the minds—movements, too—of the students, come in for a large share of what can be expressed by an ugly epithet. Those who for twenty or thirty years have been exposed to such missiles are never disturbed when a new one comes hot and hissing from the Lancaster batteries. To have the Church told for a thousand and one times that they are strife-makers, and hear it said with a solemn, accusing voice, that a "miserable faction" and a few "ciphers" are disturbing a whole corps of the grand army of the Church, and destroying its peace, is so ridiculous from their former point of view, that despite the enforced gravity and the summer heat, even the Seminary man must have yielded to laughter at the poor conceit. Then, too, the writer declares it not to be Christian to doubt the Protestantism of those who do large business in preparing editors and teachers for the Church of Rome—not Christian to doubt the fidelity to Reformed doctrines of men who write and endorse Tract No. 3, on baptism; or who deny that the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross is the only ground of our salvation. All the effect this ebullition of pent-up bile had upon us, was to make us think that the rather severe necessity of having to "take to the water" may have secreted a redundancy of the bitterness, and that it must fall on some one, and why not on those naughty ones who will not let our "beloved Professors" alone in their nice pastime of getting up a miniature Rome, and patching a hybrid

philosophy at Lancaster, while they should imbue the minds and hearts of their students with the spirit of Christ, and teach them the historic Heidelberg Catechism. Then it also reminded us of a little trick at calling names by one of the predecessors of the gentlemen at Lancaster, and how that "biter was bitten," or received "a Roland for his Oliver." It is several years since it happened, and has been recorded in a Black-letter book not always too much esteemed by those who fill chairs at Lancaster, if report be true, and not at all relished by their students, who are prepared for Rome at this "Preparatory." Those who choose to look up this precedent will find it at 1 Kings 18: 17-18, and is in these words: "And it came to pass when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, 'Art thou he that troubleth Israel?'" And he answered, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim."

We had purposed to draw a parallel between the several parties as accusers and those in reply, but it is too plain in the application. To the charge of being strife-makers we can say as confidently as Elijah, "We have not troubled the Church." That our accusers have introduced doctrines that are alien to the Reformed Church, and have abandoned her simple Protestant doctrines, of this there is no question, and all the disquiet comes from this. Ahab, estranged from the simplicity of his own nation by intercourse with the Phenicians, under the influence of his wife Jezebel, set up the worship of Baalim, and turned away the people that confided in him to idolatry. The stern prophet denounced the idolatry, and foretold God's anger for the sin. So he troubled Ahab, and so in truth the enemies of the Reformed Church, and those who mislead her confiding people, betray her children into the hands of Rome. Our Lord was charged with being one who "stirred up the people," and against the Apostles it was alleged that they "turned the world upside down." This ruse has at all times been practiced by those who are intercepted in their efforts clandestinely to propagate errors in the Church. "Men are disposed to seek the cause of their misery everywhere in the wide world rather than in themselves, where only it 'exists,'" and to place it to the account of those whom they hate or who have thwarted their hopes.

ULRIC.



UNJUST CRITICISMS OF DR. SCHNECK'S BOOK.

The church very justly lamented the unexpected death of Dr. Schneck, which took place a short time since. He was a most faithful and devoted servant of the Lord. None knew him but to love him. He was of a sensitive and retiring disposition, and had no heart for bitter or heated controversy. He shrunk from this, and yet he was always free to speak the truth, and that very plainly, when necessity required it, as all know who remember his editorial career.

He took no part in the controversy that has been going on in the Church for the last twenty years. He was not, however, an uninterested spectator of what was going on. He was one of the first who saw with a sad heart the innovations introduced into the church by Dr. Nevin, and published a faithful warning in an editorial, which appeared in the *Messenger* of September, 1851, of which he was the chief editor. As this was re-published in the last Monthly, we will make no reference to it further than to say, that it would have been a most fortunate thing if the church had heeded his timely criticisms and repudiated the speculations of Dr. Nevin.

For this noble stand which he took in 1851, in defence of the old faith of the church, he was taken to task in no mild terms by the friends of this new departure, and told that there was no occasion for alarm; that he misunderstood the teachings of Dr. Nevin, and that there was no danger of any results such as he apprehended. Seeing that the church was willing to accept the explanation of Dr. Nevin and party, and hoping for the best, he remained quiet, and in the course of a few years withdrew from the editorial department of the *Messenger*, and filled more retired positions. Thus matters went on until the last year, when he was urged by a ministerial brother to give an expression of his views upon the so-called Mercersburg theology, which has produced such troubles and agitations in the church. At first he shrank from the task, but the reasons urged were of such a serious character, that he found no rest until he began to apply himself to the work. The result was, that in the course of some six months, the book entitled *Mercersburg Theology inconsistent with Protestant and Reformed Doctrines*, made its appearance. As soon as it was

out of press, it was sought and purchased in every part of the church, notwithstanding its opponents did all in their power to limit its circulation. The reception with which it met was much greater than our departed brother had ventured to hope. He was much encouraged by the many letters which he received, thanking him for the noble stand which he had taken and the masterly defense he had made of the old faith of the church.

Here we wish to contradict the report which certain persons of the Mercersburg school have put in circulation, that Dr. Schneck expressed regret shortly before his death that he had written and published his book. One cannot help asking, what will be started next? We have no hesitancy in saying that the report is entirely groundless, having read a long and interesting letter from Dr. Schneck only a very short time before his death, in which he stated that what doubts and misgivings he had at times whilst preparing the book, were all removed, and that he was fully persuaded in his mind that he had followed the path of duty in what he had done. This avowal was made in the most free and unreserved manner.

Having said thus much in regard to Dr. Schneck and his book, we now proceed to the special object of this article, which is to notice the ungenerous criticism, if such it may be called, of Dr. Nevin, found in a foot-note of an article in the last *Mercersburg Review*, where he speaks of the book of Dr. Schneck as a *miserable travesty of "Mercersburg Theology," garbled quotations*, etc. This, it will be seen, is the old game that has been played for the last twenty years by Dr. Nevin and his disciples, that as soon as any telling exposure has been made of the erroneous positions they have taken, we hear nothing but "miserable travesty," "garbled quotations," "misunderstandings," "misrepresentations," etc., instead of a fair and manly reply. This was the course taken by Dr. Nevin in 1851, when Dr. Schneck uttered those kind but faithful words of warning referred to above. The history of the last twenty years is but a development of the specious errors which were then first announced in their crude form. Every one at all acquainted with the controversy that has been going on in the church, knows that Dr. Schneck was right in the judgment which he then passed upon the views of Dr. Nevin, and that he was guilty of no misrepresentation or misunderstanding of these views, and of the logical and necessary conclusions to which they



would certainly lead. Hence, if there was any misrepresentation, it was by Dr. Nevin himself, who quieted the fears of the church by affirming, that such was not the tendency of the views to which he gave utterance.

Now, again, we are told that Dr. Schneck's book is a "miserable travesty" of Mercersburg Theology. If this be so it would be far more honorable in Dr. Nevin if he would show, by fair argument, wherein the travesty lies. If it is a miserable caricature of Mercersburg Theology, it is presumable that it would be easy to make it appear so. This would certainly be more satisfactory than to pronounce such a categorical judgment without giving any proof of its truth. Dr. Nevin ought to know that this is no way to meet a book of such acknowledged ability and fairness. And yet it is just what we have had again and again, when an appeal was made to German theology, and the confessions and liturgies of the Church. Dogmatism suits best where argument fails.

If Dr. Schneck's book on Mercersburg Theology is a misrepresentation of the system, its own friends are at fault, and none more so than Dr. Nevin himself, from whose writings the largest extracts are taken. Any one who has read the book, knows that a very large portion of it consists of numerous and lengthy quotations from the writings of Drs. Nevin, Gerhart, Apple, etc., who are regarded as the chief exponents of the system. They are allowed in the book the most ample space to state in their own words what they teach. Hence, if there is any miserable travesty of this new theology, they are the ones who are guilty of it, and not Dr. Schneck.

It is also pitiable to hear such constant charges of misrepresentation, etc. If these brethren are not understood, why then do they not write in plain English. Our language is certainly susceptible of intelligibility. Other writers of great profundity are understood. Any one reading Dr. Hodge will have no difficulty in understanding what he teaches. His able work on theology has been read and severely criticized. Yet we never hear him crying out against his antagonists, "I am not understood; this is not what I teach," etc. But as soon as any demolishing criticism is made upon the Mercersburg Theology, our ears are at once made to ring with the sound of "miserable travesty," etc. Why is this? And whose fault is it? It is surely time that there should be an end to such warfare.

Then Dr. Nevin ought to know that the charges which he here makes of garbled quotations, etc., against Dr. Schneck's book are of a serious nature. No one who knew Dr. Schneck believes that he would be guilty of such a crime. Nor do we believe that any one who carefully reads the book and sees what copious quotations are contained in it, and the lovely spirit which it breathes in every part, will give the least credence to the charge here brought against it. It is also a very late hour for this charge. The book was out of press several months before the death of Dr. Schneck. Dr. Nevin evidently saw and read it soon after its publication. If he did not, there was no excuse for him treating a book from the pen of a man like Dr. Schneck with such disrespect, when he knew it reviewed his own teachings, and charged them as being inconsistent with Protestant and Reformed doctrine. Hence, if he knew the book was what he now says it is, it was his duty to make this known at once. And if he did not have the manliness to do it at the time, he should keep quiet now when Dr. Schneck rests in his grave, and can make no defense of himself against such grave charges.

We know, indeed, that Dr. Gerhart has published a card, in which he claims that the book contains a quotation which is not in his tract on baptism, from which it claims to be taken. For this Dr. Schneck made the most satisfactory explanation; and if Dr. Gerhart's card would have had the same frankness which his (Schneck's) explanatory letter had, the matter would have stopped there, and nothing would have been said about it, or, if anything was said, the card would have contained more than it did. Here again we think a great deal of noise has been made about a little matter, with the design, as it would seem, of diverting attention from the crushing testimony of this book. We have no objection to criticism; only let it be fair and honorable. In the name of our departed brother, we protest against such ungenerous and false criticism of his book, and affirm that it contains no travesty or garbled quotations, such as Dr. Nevin charges against it; but is on the other hand an honest and faithful vindication of the old faith of the Church of which the author was an esteemed minister.

G. W. W.

---

RICHES come better after poverty, than poverty after riches.



DR. GERHART'S EXPLANATIONS.

Dr. Gerhart's efforts to explain away his anti-biblical and anti-Reformed views of baptism, have only served to land him in the greatest contradictions and absurdities.

We affirm that both propositions are true—namely, that “we are made partakers of Christ and all his benefits” by baptism; and that all “the benefits of Christ are received, \* \* \* not by baptism, \* \* \* but by the exercise of personal faith exclusively.”

*Giving and Receiving.*—He thinks he can prove this by urging the distinction between “giving and receiving.” He says: “In baptism the grace of Christ is *given*,” and, “by faith the grace given is received and appropriated.” So, he says, the mother gives food to her little child, and the child receives what the mother gives. The “giving” is done in “baptism,” the “receiving is done “in faith.”

On this we remark, that it is undoubtedly true that God gives and man receives; but that the benefits of Christ are given in baptism exclusively, and received in faith exclusively, is a distinction unwarranted by anything we have read in the Scriptures. If this distinction were a sound one, then it is very strange indeed that the authors of the Bible did not so state; and it is an equally strange thing that the authors of the Catechism were not sufficiently enlightened to give it to us in plain and intelligible language.

No one, as we have said, denies that God gives and that man receives; but to regard baptism as exclusively the work of God, and faith as exclusively the work of man, is a discovery in theology whose credit belongs exclusively to Dr. G. Any one can at a glance see the anti-Reform character of this theory by contrasting the relations between baptism and faith, as set forth in the Catechism, with the same as set forth by Dr. G. The Catechism teaches us that the relation between the two is this: “We are made partakers of Christ and all His benefits BY FAITH ONLY,” and this faith proceeds “from the Holy Ghost, who works faith in our hearts by the preaching of the Gospel, and confirms it by the use of the Sacraments.” (65.) But, according to Dr. G., the relation between the two is this: In one sacrament (baptism) God

*gives* the grace of Christ, and then it is the duty of the man afterwards to receive and assimilate this grace by the exercise of faith. According to the Catechism, God *gives* grace (by which is meant the gift of the Holy Ghost), and thus works faith, and then *confirms* this faith by the use of baptism. According to Dr. G. the whole doctrine is turned completely around, and God gives this grace in baptism; and yet, although given, it is not yet received until man exercises faith; then it is received and assimilated. Which theory best accords with the Scriptures, the plainest man can judge.

Acts 8: 36-7: "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, *If thou believest with all thine heart*, thou mayest. And he answered and said, *I believe* that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." John 3: 36: "He that *believeth* on the Son hath everlasting life." We might inquire with respect to this last passage, since the man spoken of "hath everlasting life," where and how did he receive it, when and where was it given? Certainly not in baptism; for Christian baptism was not yet instituted. And why did Philip require faith before he would baptize the eunuch? If he had faith, then he had everlasting life, and he received this, not in baptism, but (quite Scripturally) through the work of the Holy Ghost ingrafting him with Christ.

*Objective and Subjective.*—Equally absurd is Dr. Gerhart's effort to extricate himself by saying that "*baptism*" is the "*objective*" in the powers of salvation, and that "*faith*" is the "*subjective*;" *i. e.*, the one is work done outside of us—objective—and so divine; the other is a work that goes forward inside of us—subjective—and so human. This idea seems to be this—that the objective and divine must come first, and the subjective and human must meet it; also, the former is of no value to man. Hence, as man can only be saved by Christ and his merits, and as these are objectively bestowed upon man in the rite of baptism, it is quite correct to say (according to Dr. G.) that we are engrafted into Christ and become partakers of Him by baptism. Such seems to be the argument:

No one denies that there are two factors in the process of our salvation; the one divine, the other human; the one objective, the other subjective, (although this latter distinction only darkens the subject). But to affirm that baptism is the objective and



divine, and that faith is the subjective and human, betrays a mind that is satisfied with words rather than with thoughts. The objective and divine is what God does. This includes a great deal—the incarnation, obedience, suffering, life and death of Christ, the giving of the Holy Ghost, and the working of repentance and faith in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. The subjective and human is what man does; *i. e.*, the giving up of confidence in himself and his works, the forsaking of sin, the casting of himself upon Christ alone, the exercising of repentance and faith under the working of the Holy Ghost, and the penitent and believing use of the sacraments. Dr. G.'s use of the terms, "objective and subjective," "human and divine," is very, very superficial.

*Half-Truths.*—But Dr. G. reaches a climax when he gravely argues that to affirm (with the Catechism) that we become partakers of Christ and His benefits *by faith only*, is only a *half-truth*. Our beautiful Scriptural and *profound* Catechism, in so teaching, is guilty of telling only a half-truth! It needed the Mercersburg school to arise, in order that we might be taught the other complementary half-truth; namely, that it is by baptism we are engrafted into Christ and become partakers of all His benefits! There was need that Dr. G. should write a tract setting forth this latter half-truth! There is development, you see, in theology. The first half-truth, taken alone, as we have had it for three centuries, has, perhaps, a rationalistic tendency. It is too spiritualistic (if anybody can tell what that means).

Dr. G. has a good deal to say of the "objective virtue" of baptism. We would like him to explain what an "objective virtue" is, as distinguished from a "subjective virtue." He here uses words to which he himself evidently does not attach any very distinct meaning; for, when pressed, he is quite ready to deny any reception of grace in or by baptism, but explains this "objective virtue" as meaning, simply, that in baptism God gives—not Christ himself, not regeneration, not forgiveness of sin, not deliverance from the power of the devil, but only a right and title to all these blessings *when man repents and believes*. After painfully toiling (like Sisyphus rolling his stone up hill) to establish an objective virtue in baptism, he at once tumbles the whole structure down again, *because he is afraid to stand up under it*.

HEIDELBERG.

## THE URSINUS UNION.

The success and rapid growth of the Ursinus Union is a matter of great encouragement to all who are hoping and longing that the day may come when our blessed Church will be delivered from the "novelties that disturb our peace." For it was felt at the start, and is felt very keenly yet, that error had entrenched itself so firmly in the strongholds of our Zion, that it would require strong and long-continued efforts to overcome it. The difficulty is, that those who remained true to the old historical faith, waited just ten years too long before openly resisting the "new development." There was too great a hesitancy and reluctance to say anything openly against a system that professed to be so very true to the genius and spirit of the Church. No one wished to shoulder the responsibility of so doing, and the result has shown, that those who ultimately did so, have had to pass through much obloquy and abuse. This was especially the case at the start, and is still so. Their motives have been misinterpreted and grossly misrepresented. Their characters have been assailed, especially in private. They have been held up to scorn and reproach; and a few "feeble folk," who have not the ability to discuss theological topics, are still active in circulating slanders in respect to the motives of those that oppose Mercersburg, and this is actively encouraged and rewarded by those who ought to know better. Every system of tactics that could be made oppressive to them has been tried in succession. And thus a generation of ministers has grown up, many of whom have never really moved in the genuine element of the Reform faith. These are not so much to be blamed, as pitied, for their errors. The blame rests upon their teachers, who ought to have known better.

The growth of the Ursinus Union, together with other uprisings, we say, forms to our mind a bow of promise of a better future, of a time when the Church as a whole will be genuinely Reformed.

We hope the members of Ursinus Union have counted well the step they have taken, and that they will stand firmly to their colors and "quit themselves like men." A vast majority of the members of the Church—we think at least nine-tenths of them—are at heart with the objects proposed by the Ursinus Union.



When we see the votes in Synods, it would seem as though this could not be so, because so many elders, who are the "representatives of the people," vote with the Lancaster party. But it must be remembered that even in cases where ministers and elders vote persistently for the Mercersburg novelties, they often misrepresent their charges. That particular elder is sometimes the only member in the whole charge on the side of Mercersburg. We have been informed, on what we regard as good authority, that some ministers at least never consult the Joint Consistory, or the Consistory, in the choice of elders to go to Classis. The minister simply picks out the elder, gives him his credentials, and that is the whole of it. In this way a Classis may vote very strongly and persistently for Nevinism, while there are not a score of members in the whole Classis who favor a departure from the old historical faith of the Church.

In view of this, we ought not to allow any cry of "peace," "Mittlemass," "neutrality," etc., to deceive us. This cry, so far as we can judge, is no genuine desire to maintain the old faith of the Church; it is not raised by any except such as desire to fasten the new system on the Church. We may be mistaken, of course, in our judgment, and we have not the remotest desire to do injustice to any one, but in every case where we have heard this cry raised, it has come from those who have persistently voted with and supported the Mercersburg party, and who still desire that it should prevail in our Church. The conviction has been forced upon us that this cry is only a new mode of procedure, the better to uphold the quaking fabric of Nevinism. What they want is "peace;" *i. e.*, no public exposure of the errors and superficialities of Nevinism. They want peace; *i. e.*, a full and free opportunity for the ultras to push their ritualistic and doctrinal heresies. Peace is a very pleasant thing, especially for a church, and the way of peace lies open and fair before the eyes of all men. Remove the *cause* of the controversies, and this will cease at once. Cease teaching and urging anti-Reformed doctrines and practices, and none will be better pleased than those who have opposed Mercersburg. But to cry "peace," and at the same time to work for Mercersburg, is not the way of peace.

Let us not be too sanguine of *immediate* success. The Mercersburg temple of error was twenty-five years building, with hardly any let or hindrance. We believe that twenty-five years more

will utterly wipe it out from the Reformed Church. It has no element of permanent success ; it is a mere theory. It is constantly changing its colors, like the chameleon. It is a dying reality, while it seems to live. But it is dying very slowly. Therefore, let us have patience in our work.

URSINUS.

---

## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

### SALUTATORY ORATION—NO MAN LIVES TO HIMSELF.

We are cheered to greet such an intelligent audience in our presence this morning to witness the exercises of this memorable day. And whilst it is sad to reflect that we as a class are soon to be separated, we cannot but hail this Commencement day as one filled with happy moments, the realization of joys and pleasures anticipated. Our pleasure is enhanced by your presence ; we salute you, therefore, and bid you a cordial welcome in the name of the Class of '74. That your earnest sympathies have brought you hither to enjoy this festive occasion with us, is an evidence that the cause we represent has enlisted your hearts. The successful general celebrates his victory with a grand and pompous display ; his trophies, collected from the vanquished forces of the enemy, are led in triumph before his victorious car, and his vanity is gratified by the plaudits and acclamations of the exulting multitude.

Such, however, shall not be the character of our occasion ; yet we trust that the generous impulses of your hearts may not be hushed, but may at least respond to our efforts, if deserving of approbation. Our literary festivity to-day is due to the friends who have reared this institution for a good and noble purpose—the advancement of true Christian knowledge—and also to the effi-



cient corps of instructors standing at its head. And well may we refer to the fact, that to insure permanent success, requires the earnest sympathies and hearty coöperation of its friends. We feel encouraged that a lively interest is manifested in our work here, and that our institution is already a success beyond all expectation. With this cheering prospect, let us work on for a still brighter future. We cannot but wish that the star of our Alma Mater may rise higher and higher, shine brighter and brighter, that many sons may go forth from her halls to proclaim the tidings of peace. A collegiate course and student's life is a most delightful period, and is usually entered upon with hearty good will and cheer. The mingling together of dear classmates, and the bond of intimacy woven in such close and intimate relations, constitute a pleasing episode in life's history. The languid beauty of earth's flowers may fade, the dreams and fond hopes of youth may pass away, the dearest object of life may be torn from us as with resistless fate, yet the memory of this day and place shall be one of the oases in the desert of life where we may refresh and regale ourselves when wearied and fatigued with its toils. Our presence upon the stage this morning is an indication that we are about to finish our Academic course; but what we have done is only one stepping stone to the temple of literature reared by the accumulated researches of the best men of every age. This imposing edifice requires for its passport a well-cultivated and disciplined mind, and then it opens its garnished halls to such as possess these requisites. Its diversified departments disclose treasures fraught with the most intense interest to its faithful devotee. We have gathered only a few of the pebbles that lie exposed on the ocean shore. If our minds do not deceive us, the recognition of this simple fact will serve as a stimulus to urge us on for the possession of intellectual genius more brilliant than those already collected. Our whole course in college has been directed to this single purpose, to the inculcation of noble Christian principles, through which man is eminently fitted to discharge the responsible duties of life, and in this way to consecrate himself anew to that high and noble purpose for which God designed each and every one of us. Only by a strict adherence to these principles and by a vigorous application of the knowledge acquired can we realize to the fullest extent the advantages we have enjoyed. Our conduct, our character, our whole life, must

exhibit the impress of the training we have received. The unfolding of all these results we resign to the future. Let her be the criterion of our course. What we have said already suggests the familiar theme—*no man lives to himself*. Once more we extend a hearty welcome to you all, and let the whispering breezes extend the echo—*welcome*.

If we examine the works of God in creation, we see beautiful harmony and order in the most infinite diversity. Every part of the entire universe has the impression of firm, unchangeable and uncontrollable laws. Law and arrangement are the essential attributes of all being. The perfect unanimity of creation comes to view prominently when we contemplate it as a whole, and when we, as it were, stand upon the mountain peak and have a full survey of the outstretched landscape at its base. Objects will then show to their greatest advantage, and the beauty and symmetry of the whole will stand in bold relief before our eyes. If we observe the star-lit sky night after night, we notice little or no apparent change among those celestial wanderers. They have not deviated from their course, but each one moves in the sphere assigned to it. Scan the azure firmament in the sweet and silent midnight hour, and you are filled with awe as these glittering, pending orbs shine out in their serene majesty and dignity, and seem to draw and call you thither. These lights, spread upon the vast canopy of heaven, are not without a purpose; their generous mission is to direct the lonely and desolate wanderer through the gloom and darkness of the night. The music of the celestial spheres, so beautifully conceived by Cicero, is based in the main upon their relative size and distance; the sweet harmony produced by such a perfect arrangement, and by their undeviating regularity of motion, would soon become discord by too great a tension or relaxation of the ethereal chords. We see the grand design of the great architect of the universe in all His wonderful and glorious works. Behold the mingled variety and beauty of nature all around you. Earth speaks its pure and simple language in a thousand silver tongues. Night and morning unveil her beauty to the beholding sons of men. Will you look upon all this, and in the face of it remain unmoved? Shall your eye remain dim and not consider the lilies of the field, whose glory even surpasses the gorgeous array of King Solomon? Even to the willful skeptic it must be evident that every part of creation, from



the minute and apparently insignificant forms of life to the crowning stone to which all are subordinate, has a high purpose and design in its very life and existence.

By the study of science and revelation we know that there was a grand progress in the whole scheme of creation, which verged in man as the masterpiece of all God's works, the climax of all His created perfections. As a rational and spiritual being, man has the power to discern and comprehend the truth; conscience to distinguish between right and wrong; the gift of speech, and the faculty of invention; and as head and crown of creation, he stands monarch over all. The nicest adaptation of means to a great end is plainly visible in every part of his wonderful being. Review the collective life of the race and mark the result of their united efforts. He mounts the skies and traverses the remote regions of space, where he steps from sphere to sphere, counts their numbers, gives their names, calculates their weight, and, if perchance in the limit of space he perceives that one is wanting, his mathematics mark out the place for it, and fix the point to which he directs his gaze and sees it. The sculptor infuses life-like powers and expressions into the rough, unhewn and unpolished piece of marble till it becomes fairly vivified and seems to breathe. The painter delineates figures upon his canvas that seem to step out of it to welcome you. Man does not find in himself all the varied voices of nature, but his instruments equal them. The combination of the infinite variety of sounds baffles description; its sweetness imparts exquisite pleasure and elevates our feelings and affections to heavenly things by its sublimity and grandeur. Man's grandest efforts can be traced upon the pages of the world's literature, his thoughts are inscribed and imbedded upon the previous tablets of future generations which are moulded under their genial influence as toys of wax. The heart and mind of the world are his indestructible and imperishable monuments. The structure reared by his genius shall endure through ages, when works of art shall have dwindled into decay, and all things around us perish. Do we not see in this fact that the spirit of man is made for immortality, and that this is a fit emblem of it? Truly when men devote their time, talents and all, to the unfolding of holy and heaven-born truths, when they rather submit to frightful tortures and racking pains in the horrible dungeons of the Inquisition than bow and give sanction to Popish errors, when their

whole soul is bent upon the amelioration of the deplorable and low condition of mankind through the diffusion of overpowering light and knowledge among all classes; when such is the case their lives are consecrated and in no way selfish. They are as powerful reflecting mirrors to illumine the world.

Napoleon the Great, the proudest conqueror that ever trod upon European soil, had a brilliant career, but his unbounded ambition led him to deeds of barbarity that will forever leave a stain upon his character. Proud self was the prominent characteristic of his life. His victorious arms carrying dismay over almost entire Europe, secured for him a scanty recompense in the hearts of his countrymen. Others less proud than he, flashed meteor-like through a sea of glory and suddenly vanished in the gaping abyss.

"The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,  
And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,  
Await alike th' inevitable hour;  
The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

In life we start upon an infinite journey; we pass object after object and treasure after treasure in pursuit of what seems to be higher, more permanent and enduring. Wherever the main battle of life is joined, thither we are prepared to rush. Like the general who entrenches himself within the fort, and plants his cannon upon the battlements, but forsakes all when the tide of the conflict changes, even so it is in the great battle of life. Only yesterday our lap was full of the toys and pleasures of childhood; we flung them away, not because we were tired of them, but because we said there were others more worthy of our pains, and something else than mere play. No one can look at human life—his own or that of the world—without recognizing the need of a faith like this—a faith that larger purposes are worked out for us than we ourselves are able to comprehend. In every phase of our existence there is something to remind us that our rest is not in time. Everything we do or suffer here suggests larger possibilities for our nature than we are able to realize. The hints of our immortal destiny meet us everywhere in life. How else shall the father, who holds the fainting head of his dying son, be comforted, or what shall soothe the aching heart of the mother, clasping her erring child to her bosom? If we say that the squalid miseries which stain our civilization are the mere results of violated physical laws, we are still left to cry in our anguish,



why are we thus tossed about upon the waves and billows of a stormy life, and why are we baulked and baffled at every harbor mouth that promised to be a haven of rest? Else why so many spots of sacred ground-studded with the crumbling stones of marble, beneath which the hopes and aspirations of life lie buried, the resting-place of so many millions whose faces are turned to a heaven of bliss and glory? The *only* solution for our pains and griefs, our joys and pleasures, can be found in the glorious mission of Christ, who has brought life and immortality to light, whose we are and for whom we live. Only by looking in true faith upon Him can we have a perfect realization of life. In Him to fail is to conquer, and to die is but to live, for through death we pass into life.

"Life is real, life is earnest,  
And the grave is not its goal."

It is our duty, therefore, to dedicate our life and all our actions to the welfare of our common humanity, to the weal of our country, to the interest and prosperity of Christianity, and through all these, to our God. Devotedness, zeal, and unceasing fidelity upon the field of action will have some significance, although we may not be heroes in the strife. Our emblazoned shield shall bear the motto, *with it or upon it*, in this sign our victory will be secure.

---

#### STEADFASTNESS AND STRENGTH.

*Sketch of a Baccalaureate Sermon preached in Ursinus College  
Chapel, on Sunday evening, June 21, 1874.*

1 Corinthians 16: 13. "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."

(After a few preparatory references to the solemnity of the occasion, the speaker proceeded as follows:)

The text announced plainly expresses what seems to my own mind to be an emphatic *lesson* of the hour. It furnishes also, by clear implication, the *encouragement* required by all who truly re-

alize the solemn import of that lesson. The *lesson* is, your need of *christian steadfastness and strength*. The *encouragement* is, that *divine grace is able and ready to supply this need*.

Those of you who were present at our similar service a year ago will at once perceive a close connection between the theme thus claiming our attention, and that which was then considered. My discourse this evening is meant to be a sequel to the other. I will start now where I stopped then, assuming "the certainty of Christian truth" as an established fact, and your attainment to a personal assurance of that truth in Jesus, as a matter of your happy experience.

To help you to attain to such an assured possession of "*the faith*," in the right knowledge and a hearty love of it, has been the ultimate, highest aim of our efforts. All else that has been done and taught by those under whose care and tuition you have been placed, has been made subsidiary to that truest and worthiest end. Not only have religious and scientific culture been combined in our educational work, but we have constantly striven to make the latter serve the former; even this can never be really secured in any other way.

And now, in full agreement with this aim, we conclude the work involved in our close and responsible relations to you with the far reaching and impressive admonition of the text: You have learned and been convinced of "the faith," the "one (only true) faith" of Jesus Christ. You have been led heartily to apprehend it even as you "have been apprehended" by it. Stand fast in it; be strong in maintaining it; quit you with manly courage in defending and teaching it, and in resisting all attempts to rob you of it, or to drive you from it; and that you may successfully do all this—*watch ye*.

Here, then, you have, *first* of all, *an end or object to be secured*, and secondly, a prescription of *the most effective personal means of securing it, with encouragement to their use*.

I. "*Stand fast in the faith*."

It is taken for granted, as already said, that there is *a faith*; that is, a clearly revealed system of religious truths and facts, attested as divine, authoritative and fixed. This faith is *one*, even as there is but "one Lord, one baptism, one God and Father of all." It is the same for Rome as for Ephesus, the same for Jerusalem as for Athens, the same for the nineteenth century as for



the first. In all its fundamental principles, and in its entire essential import, it is unchangeable. That faith cannot be amended, it needs no mending. It cannot be improved ; for it is perfect as taught by Christ and preached and written by His inspired apostles. No wisdom by man can lawfully or advantageously add a jot or tittle to it. No philosophy of man can truly or consistently alter it. "The faith" stands fast. As at the beginning, so now, it proclaims that Gospel whose burden is : "God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us ;" and that the redemption of fallen humanity is effected by the saving application of the benefits of the propitiatory vicarious death of Jesus Christ. Whether this suits the taste and temper of self-righteous Jews and philosophic Greeks, or offends them, the faith continues earnestly to testify, both to Greek and to Jew, that "*Christ crucified* \* \* \* is the power of God and the wisdom of God," (1 Cor. 1 : 22, 23) even that Christ, "whom God hath set forth (to be) a propitiator through *faith in His blood*," (Rom. 3 : 25), and so to be "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, (Rom. 10 : 4). *This* faith will tolerate no tampering with its essential nature so clearly revealed, or with its foundation principles so firmly laid. Any changes, additions or modifications made in it or to it, just so far make of it something else, which is no longer the faith. And this faith is thus far fixed, not only in *idea*, but also in *form*. Divine facts and truths, such as belong essentially to the faith, are set forth in *terms* which make their significance and import clear and plain. So the apostles evidently thought them, so the earliest believers regarded them. It was not until false teachers made the stream of meditation muddy with the turbid effusions of their own earthly conceits and carnal imaginings, that the waters of the fountain were darkened, and the minds and hearts of the people became confused.

The fault lay not in any lack of clearness or definiteness in the original revelation. Neither did the evil spring from any such inner flexibility of the faith or the truths composing it, as at all tempted men professing to be disciples to indulge their own fancies regarding the proper sense of those truths, or as warranted them in substituting their strange and false expositions of the faith for its proper significance.

In this view, then, the faith was fixed—fixed as a rock amidst

the billows of the sea of man's restless life ; fixed as a foundation sure and strong, and *so far* stationary as "*the* foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the cornerstone." There was no need of running to and fro, asking like Pilate, what or where is truth, any more than there was need of asking, with vain inquiry, where is Christ. The faith, "the word was nigh them, even in their mouth and in their heart, that is the word of faith which was preached." Men might blunder in darkness and flounder in fogs ; but the faith was clear, shining as a light in a dark place ; the faith offered a firm footing and a plain, reliable high-way, in which the ransomed of the Lord might walk or run with safety.

And now, because we have so sure, so positive, so fixed a faith we too are to be steadfast. Stand fast in that faith. The foundation of the Lord standeth sure. Let us stand surely and immovably on it and in it. Do this in the firm, immovable *convictions of your minds*. The faith is for the understanding. We are to have a right knowledge of it. It is for the reason, as man is preëminently a rational being, and is called by Christianity especially to yield himself to God in a rational service. (Rom. 12 : 1.) Wherefore be "sound in the faith," holding to it with the vigor of minds freed from the weakness of morbid views, healed and strong in the conscious possession of certain truth.

So know what you believe, and why you believe it, that you may not be soon "shaken in your minds," nor be easily blown about by every fresh "wind of doctrine," (windy doctrine), which may spring from the cunning craftiness of zealous deceivers and by which chaffy, unsettled Christians are kept tossing so helplessly between Rome and rationalism, between pantheism and atheism. *Having* a reason for the faith you hold, stand squarely and firmly by it, whether exposed to the ridicule or the wrath of men, in whose hands the faith is as clay, affording them stuff by which to display their artistic skill, or as a bubble to be annihilated by their high-sounding cabalism.

*Stand fast in the hearty love of the faith.* The Gospel faith is a revelation of love in the highest and holiest form. "In this was manifested the love of God, that He sent His only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him \* \* \* (as the) propitiation for our sins." (1 John 4 : 9, 10). The personal appreciation of the blessings offered by this faith begins with a peni-



tent, believing love. Its proper effect is to kindle such love in the heart, and that in the most pure and intense degree. For the matter (or contents) of the Gospel faith is not merely truth in the abstract, but truth in a living personal form in Him who is *the* truth. And "*He* is altogether lovely."

Doubtless there may be a love of truth as such, of truth in the abstract; but truth incarnate appeals to the emotional nature with far greater power. And when that truth incarnate exhibits as its chief central object a Redeemer by the atoning offering of Himself in vicarious propitiation, it appeals to our repentant hearts with a power that is next to irresistible. "I, if I be (when I shall have been) *lifted up*, will draw all men unto me."

The faith so apprehended engages not only the deepest convictions of an enlightened mind, but still more fully the warmest devotion of a heart in which the "love of God is *shed abroad* by the Holy Ghost." Such love of the faith is "strong as death." "Nothing shall separate us from it." And it is all the stronger for being rational, enlightened, knowing—not a mere blind impulse, not a mere sentimental affection, not a flame kindled by the blazing fires of superstition, the lighted candles or the burning censers of pagan or Romish altars.

In this love of the faith, of the whole faith, and of each of its doctrines in particular, *stand fast*. Let your love of it be an enduring, steadfast love, not easily chilled by the cold blasts of a heartless rationalism; not easily seduced by the "fine arts" of glittering speculations. As you have learned it, in Christ, so cling to it. The purple and fine linen of rich worldly wisdom may have greater attractions for the carnal reason and the carnal heart. The "sounding brass and tinkling cymbals" of "many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision" (Titus 1: 10) may seem to have the advantage in a "show of wisdom," so that light heads may be turned, and light hearts be ensnared. But having learned to love the faith for its divine truth, and heavenly excellence, let its "simplicity in Christ," be more precious to you than all the specious allurements of proud, spangled error, and hold your love in bonds which nothing can relax or break.

II. But such steadfastness demands *vigilance, courage* and *enduring strength*, on the part of those who have *the faith* committed to them, either as a treasure of personal wealth or as a sacred

trust, to be guarded and preserved for the glory of God, for the maintenance and spread of the kingdom of Christ, and for the good of the world. All three are demanded, because, in general, *the faith as held by those professing it* is exposed to danger from the enmity and assault of insidious, daring and powerful foes. As divine, eternal truth, the principles and doctrines of the faith are safe. No craft, no subtlety, no might of hating and hateful men and devils, can harm it, mutilate it or destroy it. But as *our* faith, or that of the professing Church (ecclesia) of any age or period, it is constantly liable to be lost through perversion, corruption and fraud. This, alas, is only too abundantly proven by the history of Christianity from apostolic times to the present day. Hence the earnest admonitions of the Scriptures in terms like those of the text.

I will not attempt to enumerate in detail the various forms of hostility to the faith which you may have to encounter, under the too comprehensive classes of openly avowed enemies, such as infidels or atheistical skeptics and disguised foes, or such as, under the garb of Christianity and blatant protestations of catholicity and churchliness, betray their real character by their words and deeds. For all the purposes of instruction and warning, evangelical apologetic literature will amply supply what you need. Should any of you be shaken or disturbed in your minds by the insidious, craftily concealed atheism or impersonal deism of bold and pretentious scientists like Darwin, Huxley, Mill and Tyndall, or their French and German coadjutors, read such exposures of their sophistries and refutations of their array of assured facts, as are supplied by *Burr's Ecce Coelum, Ad fidem, and Pater Mundi*, (two series) by the pen of Agassiz, and kindred writers in English, or, if you prefer, by such ripe scholars of a perfectly Christian character as Germany has of late years furnished in cheering numbers. If the pantheistic subtleties of a Schelling, a Fichte or a Hegel, and their variously-shaded schools, or the grosser speculations of European materialism, should at all perplex you, read and study such calm but complete replies to all, and vindications of a pure Apostolic Christianity, as the work of *Christlief* on "Modern Doubt," etc., recently published by the *American Tract Society*. These helps are recommended, not, of course, as sufficient independently of a devout and constant study of the Holy Scriptures, but as subordinately auxiliary to that



study. For after and above of all the aid which may be derived from the writings of good and learned men, you will find your best defense and security in "the shield of faith, the sword of the Spirit, the girdle of truth, and the sandals (greaves) of the Gospel of peace."

But whilst compelled thus summarily to dismiss the consideration of perils to which you may be liable from the impudent or insidious assaults of such foes of true Christianity, I must direct your special attention to other foes, from whose schemes and efforts you have probably more to fear than from the bolder hostility of more audacious enemies.

It is hardly needful to say that I refer to the treasonable attempts to betray and subvert evangelical Protestantism, which have started in the camp of genuine modern Christianity itself. Wolves in sheep's clothing have gotten into the fold, who are now seeking to devour it. Watchmen set to guard the gates of the city have been throwing them open to the enemy. Men avowing and solemnly pledging loyalty to the blessed cause, entrusted with the citadels of defense, have been tampering with the foe outside, and have been trying to intimidate and undermine the confidence of the inhabitants within.

What else shall be said of such movements as that known by the name of Puseyism (to designate it by a word) in England and America? It may assume protean shapes, and may speak various dialects; but its aim and natural end is, to play into the hands of the most hurtful foe of Apostolic Christianity in ancient or modern times—Romish Popery.

By Jesuitical machinations in matters of ecclesiastical economy, by crafty tactics and cunning artifices, by false pretences and fraudulent dissimulations, by oaths of friendship disguising purposes of treason, by undermining the foundations of our faith on the plea of searching after flaws in order to mend them—in a word, by the most artful combination of all the strategies which have ever been employed against the cause of truth—the very life of the only form of Christianity in the nineteenth century worthy of the name is now put in the greatest jeopardy.

Deluded by these machinations and artifices, even some good men, who may at heart most sincerely love that Christianity are misled and decoyed into giving aid and comfort to the foe.

No doubt our modern evangelical Protestantism has, in the

course of three centuries, contracted evils which need attention. But still less can it be doubted, that advantage is taken of this fact to cover attempts at curing those evils, which must issue in the utter destruction of the cause. To heal the diseases of Protestantism by inoculating it with the pestilential poison of Popery, must be deprecated as worse than a desperate remedy. And yet, such, virtually, is the remedy which some ecclesiastical doctors prescribe and apply! Better have a limping and bleary-eyed Protestantism, if we needs must endure some malady, than that leprosed, cancered carcass which cloaks its hideousness under the folds of that gross misnomer, Holy Catholic Church.

Among the artifices thus employed in our day, against which you need most diligently to watch, we name the following :

1. The pretentious theory of *doctrinal developments*, in the particular form in which it is often pressed. There is a true development even in the sphere of Christian theology and philosophy. You have often heard it commended in these halls, and have seen it exemplified. But frequently the principle is perverted into an excuse and a blind for reviving some of the worst errors of past ages, and of securing new currency to sacerdotal, hierarchical and ritualistic schemes, which the history of the Church during her saddest centuries have stamped as a most baneful curse. There are men in our day, and men claiming to be Protestants, evangelical and Reformed, who have such vain confidence in their superior wisdom and power, as to think that they can make grapes grow from thorns and figs from thistles; men, also, who try to persuade others to acknowledge their pretensions, and sometimes succeed. From popish principles as seed, they claim to be able to raise Christian fruit. Out of cockatrice eggs they propose to hatch birds of Paradise. We have seen the results of their efforts, the issue of their boasted development. And you may see them, too, in a Wolff, an Ermentrout, a Wagner, a Phillips, a Snively, a Stewart, a Forney, *developed* by the process, from Protestants into Papists, from preachers of "the faith" of our fathers, into devotees of the "accursed idolatry of the mass."

My young brethren, beware of the specious development theory of a school which furnishes such illustrations of the real import of its theory, and such specimens of its skill.

2. Be vigilant, also, against a certain sort of *pretentious philosophy* which has recently again been trumpeting its own praises,



and seeking to captivate youthful minds especially, by a glittering display of what assumes to be profound erudition. Remember how easily error and ignorance may conceal themselves under a high-sounding phraseology. You have heard of Hegel's *logic*, and of his speculations so abstruse and deep that the severest study could hardly comprehend them, if at all. And yet, after a half century of effort to analyze or penetrate his meaning, a most competent recent critic assures us, that in his loftiest soarings and profoundest reveries, Hegel has only "mocked us with a shadow."

And shall you suffer yourselves to be deluded by the vauntings of such philosophies? Will you permit ranting dreamers, themselves "deceived with words," to betray you into running labyrinthine rounds with them, in the mists and darkness of their own theosophic or pantheising conceits? "Watch ye." Why should you be tempted away from the truly profound philosophy of heavenly truth by the false charms of error, speaking in an unknown and unintelligible tongue, merely because it speaks in such a tongue.

3. Once more, you need to watch against *sophistical and deceptive modifications* of the old apostolic faith, which seek to insinuate old errors under new terms, and to ensnare the mind and heart of those eager for knowledge, by cunningly contrived imitations of the truth. Old Error is an old fox when it dare not show its fiercer nature. Did not Arianism prevail for a time by adopting the very test-term of orthodoxy, merely adding an *i* to the word? How many good, and even learned men, were caught by that seemingly innocent *iota*!

Beware, my dear young friends, beware of subtle distinctions between objective grace and its subjective appropriation, or rather of the artful, hoodwinking use often made of the distinction. Beware of plausible attempts to induce us to exchange "the *form* of sound words" you have inherited, for sounding words of forms and ceremonies cloaking deadly errors, as a sugar coating covers pills of poison. And most especially when advocates of strange and dangerous conceits, finding their attempts to force them by violence upon a church, thwarted, cry peace, peace, heed the appeal as a summons to increased watchfulness, and to preparation for intenser conflicts.

To these we might easily add other needful cautions; but time

fails, and we must leave you to the warnings of your own discretion, stimulated by faith in God.

The vigilance commended, however, must be combined with manly *courage* and *heavenly strength*; courage, because the assailants of truth are often violent and fierce. In this respect their symbol, according to the Scriptures, is a lion roaring with hunger for some prey. "Behold their threatenings," was Peter's suppliant cry to the Lord, after he had been once snatched from their grasp.

Such as may be constitutionally timid or cautious, from too great a concern for their supposed personal interests, may stand in special need of this spiritual courage. The advocates of error may have patronage to bestow or gifts to distribute; they may hold the keys of Peter, and those keys may at the same time be used as sharpened swords or as heated thunderbolts.

"Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee," are words which a sacerdotal churchism has often borrowed from the life of Pilate, and employed with full purpose to execute them, just as Pilate did, so far as God may permit.

But true courage, that inspired by faith in Christ, can frustrate the threat, and the malice prompting it. Such courage you may need. Cultivate it diligently, remembering that whosoever "loseth his life for the sake of Christ and His Gospel shall find it;" losing the life temporal to find the life eternal.

In like manner you need *strength*. The conflict may not be over in an hour or a day. Enlist, therefore, for a life's warfare, if need be. Learn to "endure hardness as a good soldier of Christ." "Let not him that putteth on the harness boast as he (may) that putteth it off." The assaults of error are more frequently long sieges than sudden and brief sallies. Popery was centuries in gaining its victory. Puseyism, in England, has been sapping and mining for fifty years since its Tract No. 3 was published, and before it sent *hundreds* to popery instead of a few scattered victims. Wherefore remember that you add to vigilance and undaunted courage the patience of strength obtained from the Lord. "Endure unto the end, and thou shalt be saved."



## SPECIAL ITEMS.

*Presentation of Dr. Wolff and the response.* The following briefs of the address and reply connected with the presentation of the Gold Chronometer, at the recent Commencement of Ursinus College, are prepared from memoranda furnished by a member of the graduating class.

Immediately after conferring the degrees upon the graduating class, and the President was about to announce the honorary degrees passed by the Board of Directors, Dr. Wolff, who was occupying a seat on the right of the stage, arose, and begging permission to interrupt the exercises for a few moments said :

On looking over this large audience my eye sees many cheering faces, and many warm friends, who seem to be highly pleased with the exercises of the hour, and delighted with the proofs of encouraging success in the work of this Institution. I rejoice to notice, also, that even a larger number of friends have favored this occasion with their presence than attended last year's Commencement.

This fact means something. It is the second Commencement of this young but flourishing College. Pleased with the first-fruits sent out a year ago, and learning more fully to appreciate the claims and importance of our Institution, increased interest in the School has been awakened, and a larger number of friends has been drawn to its annual festival. The Institution is gaining ground, and winning new friends, as its work and aims are better and more generally understood.

The College bears the name of *Ursinus*, one of the pillars of the Reformation of the 16th century ; the author of the Heidelberg Catechism, and of many able works maintaining and defending the cause of Evangelical Protestantism. For more than three hundred years Ursinus has been held in great honor by the Reformed Church, for his Christian integrity of character, as a learned and sound theologian, and most especially as one who devoted his life untiringly to the defence and furtherance of the pure Apostolic Christianity which had been again revived, but which was even then already assailed by wild fanatics on one side, and by ecclesiastical bigots, popish and others, on the other side. Amidst violent and bitter opposition from both sides, Ursinus earnestly and

manfully contended for the true faith, that to which the largest portion of the Protestant church clings to this day.

And when, five years ago, circumstances it is not necessary to enumerate led a number of Christian men to establish an institution for the special maintenance and defence of that old faith, they could find no name which served so well to set forth their principles and design, as that of *Ursinus*.

This Institution, thus founded, is placed in the hands of professors and instructors who are worthy of the position they occupy, and who are well qualified to maintain and promote the important interests which it represents. At the head of the corps of Instructors we have placed a man believed to be specially competent to discharge the duties resting upon him, and qualified for the high trust committed to him. He has ably performed his work so far, and faithfully carried out the duties of his responsible position, to the entire satisfaction of all friends and co-workers in the cause.

And now (turning to the President) in warm appreciation of your earnest labors so satisfactorily performed, and as a slight token of regard for yourself personally, and for the cause you represent, in the name of this large company of friends, I herewith present to you this box, with its contents, and this roll of greenbacks."

*The response.*

Taken utterly by surprise by this wholly unexpected demonstration of kindness, and of interest, especially in the cause in which we are engaged, you will readily excuse my embarrassment. And yet amidst the confusion of thought and feeling naturally caused by this testimonial of your regard and confidence, as munificent as it has been unexpected, I find rising up in me a deep sense of thankfulness for what you have so generously conceived and done. I am fully conscious of your kind over-estimate of my services; and, whilst appreciating your kind assurances of personal interest, understand that it all springs, as it should, rather from your zeal for the great and good cause to which we are all in common devoted. In this view I thankfully accept your gift, and shall feel stimulated by it to pursue the work to which you, under God, have called me, with renewed energy and determination.

It is indeed most cheering to receive such positive and substantial assurances of your appreciation of what has been thus far ac-



complished. We have often been charged with being mere negativists and spiritualistic Gnostics. Surely this testimonial so far disproves the calumny. You have found something tangible and positive of which to approve, and have known how to express your approval in a very positive and real way.

It is highly gratifying, also, to discern in this token unmistakable evidence of the actual and solid progress of our cause, and particularly of your own convictions of this fact. You have assembled here from different parts of the church and country. You represent I know not how many communities and congregations, reaching from the Delaware to the Alleghenies. You know prevailing Christian sentiments, as we here, working at our posts, cannot well know them. And you declare to-day, again, in this emphatic manner, what has often before been testified, that the principles and cause to which this Institution is dedicated, are everywhere warmly cherished, and are making certain progress.

Allusion has been made to the occasion, aim and purpose of Ursinus College. That they are worthy of our devoted zeal is justly and devoutly felt. I need add but little to what has been already said.

Our Institution is, in a special sense, the child of Providence. It owes its establishment to circumstances for which its founders are not responsible. Indeed I know that those of them, at least, who are members of the Reformed Church, would greatly have preferred that such an Institution could have been dispensed with. The need of it was felt for some years, before they yielded to the necessity which pressed upon them with growing weight. And there are those here to-day who can testify how long I discouraged the undertaking, in the vain hope that those who were pursuing a course injurious to the historical faith and practice of evangelical Protestantism would see their error, and abandon their attempts. Many of us had personal reasons for attachment to existing institutions, and felt loath to do any thing prejudicial to them or to those in charge of them. Personally we had sustained relations of fraternal friendship with them, and although constrained seriously to differ from their peculiar views, and earnestly to oppose their measures, for doing which they sought to inflict private injuries, we were so free from feelings of personal animosity as to cherish the desire and hope that our ecclesiastical wrongs might yet be rectified.

The delusion of such a hope was proven by the harsh and arbitrary course of the new theology party at the Synod of Baltimore in 1867, in regard to the Myerstown Convention ; again by the still worse spirit betrayed by that party at Hagerstown, in 1868, and subsequently at Danville, where Geo. Dering Wolff took so prominent and active a part in the bad work, in 1869. The party showed, especially from 1866, (at York and Dayton) a fixed determination to carry out their schemes to the most extreme results, doctrinal and ritualistic.

This left to the friends of the old faith and principles of Evangelical Protestantism in the Reformed Church, no alternative but either to abandon the Church to the subversive measures of the Romanizing party, or to devise and set in operation some decided means of thwarting those measures.

The undertaking was a serious one, in every outward point of view. The party whose revolutionary efforts called for firm resistance, seemed to have every thing in its favor but truth and right. It held, by whatever means, the Eastern institutions of the Church in its hands, and had control of their educational influence. Those institutions had been liberally endowed, and had the advantage of years of confidence in them. The Church, and largely the ministry too, were unsuspecting of the danger threatening, and there was no way of reaching the masses, to warn them of the peril. There had been voices raised in testimony against the growing evil, but such was the confidence of a trusting Church, that those voices were not heeded.

Further, the spirit of the new order party had sufficiently revealed itself to make it certain that they would resist and crush with violence, if possible, any earnest, effective attempt which might be made to thwart their schemes. And one of the first things demanded was the establishment of such an institution as that whose second full Commencement is celebrated to-day.

And what seemed most disheartening, the friends of the old faith had nothing to begin with but faith and hope, and a firm, ardent love for the sacred inheritance of truth bequeathed to them. They had (in the East) no paper, no organization, no school, no funds.

But though destitute of such important formal appliances, they knew that almost the entire Church, east and west, was with them, so far as the heart of the Church could be reached and find utterance.



Thus was Ursinus College founded, and for such purposes ; and with joyful gratitude we may see to-day that it has not been established in vain. It rests on the solid foundation on which the great and good man whose name it bears built three hundred years ago. In regard to the principles on which it is founded, I may say that they have been clearly and positively defined. It utters no uncertain sound, takes refuge to no Talleyrandic concealment of its philosophy or theology, when called to account for either, under ambiguous terms. Its yea means yea, and its nay means nay. It seeks no patronage and solicits no aid under false pretenses. The inscription of the banner here unfurled is no fraudulent deception. Ursinus College, though in no sense sectarian, is Protestant, evangelical and Reformed, in distinction from every phase of a false rationalism and of open or secret Romanism.

And the strong sympathy you have to-day manifested, with increased enthusiasm, in our cause, inspires fresh zeal and vigor for the work in which we are all engaged. You have endorsed our efforts and aims with a bold hand, and by an act whose significance is clear. On my own behalf, and that of my brothers in the Faculty, accept our sincerest thanks for your encouragement. By the help of the Lord, we shall prosecute our work with renewed ardor. His blessing manifestly rests upon our cause. The Church is everywhere bidding us God speed. Only let us be faithful, undaunted and persevering, and the truth and right for which we are struggling will be vindicated and must prevail.

*Since the Commencement* we have received a number of letters from friends who attended the festivity, reiterating the pleasure they felt in the privilege, and their increased interest in the cause.

*Julius H. Shuford*, one of our recent graduates, who had studied theological branches in connection with his academic course, has been licensed and ordained by the Classis of North Carolina, and is now actively engaged in pastoral labors. May the blessing of the Lord crown his efforts with success.

*Joseph H. Hunsberger*, a graduate of the Class of 1873, was licensed by the Classis of Philadelphia, and expects soon to take a pastoral charge.

*The Fall Term* of the College will open on *Monday, August 31st*. All who expect to enter should be promptly here on that day. For a Catalogue, and special information, apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., President,  
Freeland, Montgomery Co., Pa.

TRAINS FOR FREELAND LEAVE—

PHILADELPHIA—Thirteenth and Callowhill, at 7:30 A. M., and 5:15 P. M.; Ninth and Green at 1:30 and 4:30 P. M.

READING—At 7:30 A. M., 12 m., and 4 P. M.

HARRISBURG, via Reading, at 5:30 A. M., and 2 P. M.

The *Perkiomen* Branch Railroad is now complete to *Pennsburg*, and persons residing within five or ten miles of *Pennsburg* will find it most convenient to take that route. Trains leave *Pennsburg* daily at 5:40 and 7:30 A. M.; 12:15 and 4:15 P. M.

From full reports published we learn that the *Commencement* of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, was conducted in a very spirited manner. Large audiences attended the exercises, and some special features were added to give increased zest to the festivities. By this statement, however, we are not to be understood as commending those specialties.

*Mercersburg College* celebrated its *Commencement* a week later than ours. The efforts to make the occasion an interesting one are reported to have been very successful.

*Catalogue of Calvin Institute*, located in Cleveland, Ohio, for the year ending July 3, 1874. This institution was founded some years ago by the Rev. Dr. Ruetenik. It is now under the special supervision of Erie and Heidelberg Classis (of the Northwestern Synod). Its educational scheme is modeled mainly after German Gymnasias, with such modifications as circumstances in this country demand. The instructors in the institute are: Rev. J. H. Ruetenik, D. D., O. Pinhard, A. M., H. Pens. The great aim of the school is to afford a thorough Christian education, fitting young men for the earnest duties of life.



## EDITORS' DESK.

*The financial management* of the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY is now in the hands of *Mr. Jno. H. Pearsol*, Lancaster, Pa. Subscribers will please bear this in mind, and remit all dues to him. As Brother Pearsol is an experienced hand at the business, an expert in the line, we hope that all in arrears will be prompt in paying up.

To avoid misapprehension, we add, that except in the matter above stated, our relations to the Monthly as editor and publisher remain unchanged, and all articles, letters, etc., intended for the Monthly are to be addressed directly to us, as heretofore.

It is hoped that our friends will kindly continue their efforts to obtain new subscribers. The more widely the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY and its energetic senior co-worker, the *Christian World*, with its important Eastern Department, under *Brother S. H. Reid*, of Milton, are circulated, the better for the cause of truth in our error-stricken Church.

---

*That Mutilated Letter.*—Dr. Gerhart sullenly persists in withholding Dr. Schneck's letter from the readers of his paper. To serve his own purpose he took out a part of the letter, and published that part in such a way as to make the impression that it was all of the letter in which the public had any interest. In so doing, he wronged the living, which he evidently meant to do; and wronged the dead, about which, in his zeal to malign the living, he seems to have been indifferent. But the device was providentially detected. A copy of Dr. Schneck's letter to Dr. G., found among papers of the deceased brother, reveals the probable reason why Dr. G. did not publish the whole of it. It would have told the readers of Dr. G.'s paper some things which his party would rather keep back. On the discovery of this secret, Dr. G. was afforded an opportunity to make amends for the wrong perpetrated. Clearly, it was his duty to do so. He owed it not only to Dr. Schneck, as one unable to vindicate himself; he owed it also to those whom Dr. G. sought to smite by this unwarranted use of a hand palsied in death, and whom that very hand, whilst yet living, had sought to vindicate; he owed it, finally, to the readers of his paper, many of whom love and honor Dr. Schneck, and who had a right to know *all he had written* to Dr. G. in that letter. But in the face of these plain demands of right and truth, Dr. G. refuses, thus far, to publish the letter. This conduct may suit the ethics of "the department of theology and criticism" of the Lancaster school. Others, however, whose moral sense has not been so perverted, will pass their own severe judgment upon the case. Dr. G. may feel deeply mortified at his failure to sustain his charge of a quotation, "false as to *matter* and form," but he has no right to mutilate a letter in the attempt.

---

*A Hard Question.*—Why has not the "*Reformed Church Messenger*" published the address of Dr. Gerhart before the late Lutheran (Old and High Church) Synod at Lancaster? It may not be easy to answer this question. Such addresses

have often been published in Dr. G.'s favorite paper, and there were many reasons why this particular address should have appeared. It bears the marks of having been cautiously studied out before-hand; indeed, it may have been read from manuscript. It lays stress on a point of much interest to our members at this time, an assumed very close doctrinal relationship of the two Churches (!), a likewise assumed closer drawing together, doctrinally and otherwise, of the two, and expresses the warm hope that this inward drawing together may soon take a more definite outward form.

By all means the address should have been published in the paper aforesaid, as a sign of the times. It furnishes additional proof of the strong tendency of the Lancaster party towards high-church Lutheranism. For the Synod named belongs to that phase, and is probably the leading Synod of that brand in the General Council. It does not call itself a Synod, but *Ministerium*. That no concessions have been made on its part, is well known. All the drawing together has been one-sided. This Prof. Fritschel, of Iowa, firmly maintained, as was shown in the MONTHLY some time ago, Old Lutheranism stands immovably fixed on its own ground. If Lancaster Reformed Professors and it are coming closer together, it is by the former surrendering Reformed principles and going over to Lutheran principles, especially in regard to the Sacraments, and related doctrines. It is easy, therefore, to understand the meaning of Dr. G.'s declarations, that the two are drawing nearer together. It means that his party is becoming more and more Lutheran, and consequently less and less Reformed. Now as the Lutheranism in question is a sort of compromise with Romanism, or the doctrines referred to (Dr. Krauth calls it the *Conservative* Reformation), it is plain enough how our Lancaster friends can cherish and avow so much sympathy for it. This view of the matter is confirmed by the following criticism translated from a German Lutheran paper, (*The Lutheran K-Zeitung*): "This inner union between the Reformed and Lutheran, of which both gentlemen\* spoke, is something quite new to us and constrains us to conclude that in the East the Reformed Church is not *decidedly Reformed*, but is drawing nearer to the Lutheran Church; for the reverse is certainly not the case. \* \* \* It would be interesting to us if Pastor Brobst (of Allentown) would shed some light on this point."

Meanwhile we will trespass somewhat upon our limited space and time by copying a few extracts from the address. It opens by stating the pleasure felt in the privilege of appearing before the "venerable Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania" as the delegate of the "oldest organization of the Reformed branch of the Reformation Church in the New World, the mother Synod of all the Synods of the Reformed communion."† Then Dr. G. said: "Holding

\*The Rev. Dr. Schaeffer, President of the Luth. Ministerium, responded favorably to Dr. G.'s address.

†Our Lancaster friends make as great account of this fact as Popery does of being "the mother Church," and try hard to use it for their own ends. Having the formal ascendancy in this Synod, and being able to sway its counsels to their own mind, it gives them great joy thus to speak of it. But let this dear old mother once wake from her slumber, and chide those errant sons for their betrayal of her most sacred treasures, and we shall probably hear them praise her as dubiously as they did the last General Synod.



tenaciously the great fundamental principles of Protestantism, (!!) it is under these circumstances, in the fullest sense of the word, proper and becoming that there should be between us, annually, reciprocal recognition and an interchange of Christian salutations." Next he acknowledges, that in past years there have been occasional frictions between the two churches (as Lehigh and Northampton counties, etc., could testify—Ed. Monthly); but comforts himself that *now* (since Lancaster has found a panacea for such ills—Ed. M.) all occasion for such friction is disappearing. Then he proceeds with gravest dignity to affirm: "I hold it to be an evident truth, that we have been *gradually approaching, in point of theological apprehension and liturgical worships* (*italic our own*); and thereby the way is being prepared for more hearty coöperation in the practical work of the Church; and for a more decided and powerful protest, on the one side, against the arrogance of Romanism (these blows at Romanism come, alas! too late to be credited as sincere—Ed. M.), and on the other, against the unchurchly tendencies alike of rationalism and fanaticism."

[Misery makes strange bed-fellows. But how happy the "venerable Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania" must have been made by these very obsequious overtures. Or, how it must have made our friend Dr. C. P. Krauth smile, sub rosa, to hear a learned theological professor of the Reformed Church claim such consanguinity of the Reformed with the Lutheran Church, so soon after the publication of his (Dr. K.'s) *Conservative Reformation*, and his philippic against Reformed doctrines in the *Mercersburg Review*. It would have been as good as salad to have caught a glimpse of his quick eye whilst Dr. G. was going on in this style.—Ed.]

Further on Dr. G. says: "The *fundamental* doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism are now more firmly and intelligently held *than at any previous period* in the history of our Church in this country."

[In the sense and application in which this assertion was evidently made by Dr. G., it deserves to be indignantly repelled and severely rebuked. It is false and libellous, and in the worst sense, for it is a slander upon the learning and fidelity of the fathers and founders of the Reformed Church in this country. Assaults made by Nevinites upon ourselves personally can be treated with contempt; but when they stand forth and falsely arrogate claims which reflect dishonorably upon our ecclesiastical fathers, the arrogance becomes intolerable. And the speaker, in this case, should have shown more respect for his antecedents than to have let the pretentious assumption of aliens among us so far intoxicate and blind him as to lead him to endorse and trumpet their pretensions. And then, too, to have the effrontery to make such an assertion so soon after the assault in his paper upon the doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism concerning "the ground and foundation of our salvation." What must "the Doctors of the venerable Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania," some of whom doubtless read the "theology and criticism" department of Dr. G.'s paper, have thought of his assertion! This assertion, furthermore, made just after boasting of the "gradual approaching" of the two bodies!! Wonder if Drs. Schaeffer, Krauth and Mann remembered, as they listened to their congenial friend, how much Flacius, Illyricus, Hesshurst, Brenz, and other noted old Lutherans like the

"Heidelberger," found in it to harmonize with old Lutheranism. Well might one of the members of the Ministerium say, he goes too far for me. And with equal truth might another member say; Dr. G.'s assertions contradict historical facts. The historical position of Ursinus College is much more in harmony with the historical faith and character of the Reformed Church, than that held by Lancaster, as represented by Dr. Gerhart.—ED.]

To let Dr. G. speak once more we quote: "The advanced position which you are asserting, and the conscious freedom with which you confess the unaltered symbols of the original Lutheran Church, *we recognize as being a great gain* to the actual Christianity of our land, and by consequence, also, *an indirect gain and strong support to us*, as contending with you for the objective reality and for the distinctively Christian elements of our holy religion. \* \* \* Our views are alike churchly and sacramental." Und so weiter. Sat. This address may variously impress different minds. How it impressed us may be summed up in a few brief sentences:

1. It was a lame and awkward attempt to conciliate a wing of the Lutheran Church in this country which will listen to union on one condition only, that of an unconditional surrender to its own claims.

2. It was a grievous misrepresentation of the actual sentiments of the Reformed Church, under the strange delusion of the party to which Dr. G. belongs, that *it* is the Reformed Church.

3. In his desire to magnify himself and his party, Dr. G. did not shrink from casting reproach upon the Reformed Church as a whole. He exhibited her as *only now, now* that the Lancaster luminaries were shining benignantly upon her waking up to a due appreciation of the Heidelberg Catechism, and a right apprehension of its true sense. Nobody knew what the Heidelberg Catechism meant until certain expounders arose to explain it during the last twenty years.

4. Still gadding about for alliances we thought, among other thoughts. These Lancaster ecclesiastics have no pleasure in their nominal home. First (1840, &c.,) they cast winning glances to the right, then (1850) to the left, then turn around and look backwards. They are willing, it would seem, to be everything by turns; only they feel they are not, and cannot be, sincerely and heartily *Reformed*.

---

*Gleanings from Other Periodicals.*—The *Evangelist* (edited by Dr. Ruetenik) of July 23, furnishes interesting editorial answers to several practical questions recently submitted to it, which we give in brief:

Under the *general inquiry, is it Reformed?* The editor very properly replies, that in view of the fact that our Churches, though supplied with various liturgies, has none duly authorized, it is difficult to answer positively any questions concerning constitutional customs or practices; but that in accordance with the liberty allowed by Reformed principles in regard to non-essential, some diversity in such non-essential may be tolerated; only those diversities must not conflict with the proper genius, spirit and faith of the Church.

The *first special question* raised is: Is it Reformed to receive new members by a public profession? Answer: Strictly speaking, it is not. All children



born in the Church are regarded as being members by reason of this fact. Hence the public reception of such is out of the question. But as in this country particularly, many others apply for admission, a formal reception of them by public profession is right and proper, in accordance with the disciplinary principle involved in the 81st question of the Heidelberg Catechism.

*Second Question:* Is it Reformed to cast earth upon the body in the burial of the dead, and to bless the corpse? To the first part of this inquiry the reply is, it is not a strictly Reformed usage, but being a thing indifferent in itself, and harmless, it may be permitted. The latter part of the question is unqualifiedly negatived. It is contrary to Reformed usage, and to Reformed principles, to invoke a benediction upon any lifeless thing, even upon the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, though, of course, we may pray the Lord to bless us in their proper use. This rests upon the distinction made in the Reformed Church between what is corporeal and spiritual, and our rejection of the doctrine that in the Lord's Supper the human body or nature of the Lord is eaten in, with, and under the bread and wine.

It is gratifying to find such points treated as distinctly and practically, and must serve to confirm the readers of the *Evangelist* in the true Gospel Faith of their Church.

---

The "*Kirchen-Zeitung*," (of the German Classis of Philadelphia) continues to maintain its greatly improved character under the editorial management of the Rev. N. Gehr, D.D. It furnishes its readers from week to week with sound and interesting articles, practical and instructive, and always in harmony with the established evangelical faith of the Reformed Church. The K.-Z. merits the most favorable consideration of all our German brethren, especially in Eastern Pennsylvania.

---

*The Liturgical movement in the Presbyterian Church*, which has been heralded in some quarters as remarkable and promising, really amounts to no more than a little agitation raised by a very few men. We have been assured by those who have the best means of knowing, that the attempt meets with no favor of any account. In fact, it hardly produces a ripple on Presbyterian waters. The virtual failure of the Rochester liturgical church, stands as a warning in the way. Why are not our people told the whole truth in regard to such things?

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

From the *American Tract Society*, Philadelphia Branch, No. 1408 Chestnut street.

"*Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*." By *Theodore Christlieb, D.D.* Translated from the German.

It would be more grateful and easy to indulge in a full exhibition of the

character and merits of this admirable work, than to dispose of it in the brief notice to which we are necessarily limited. As "a series of apologetic lectures addressed to earnest seekers after truth," it is well entitled to unqualified commendation. Here and there concessions may be met with which may seem too liberal. But the conciliatory purpose of the author, so far as it could be allowed in harmony with the truth, serves satisfactorily to explain such concessions. Throughout it takes and holds high evangelical ground, exposing unreservedly the errors of materialism and pantheism in their most specious phases, and demonstrating the rational superiority of the apostolic faith, as maintained by evangelical Protestantism.

Most of all does Dr. Christlieb's skill in making difficult things plain excite admiration. It stands in strong contrast with the unhappy faculty displayed by some would-be profound theologians of making plain things difficult, darkening counsel by words (*words, words*) without knowledge.

His criticisms upon (German) pantheizing speculations will be found specially clear and instructive. Spinoza and *Hegel*, dissected by his sharp blade, are proven to be but delusive mockers. Especially does Hegel, the Dagon of modern pantheism, fall before the ark of truth. This may be poor comfort to those who have wasted years in trying to master Hegel. But it is cheering to those who may have been taunted with their lack of taste for Hegelian studies for refusing to spend their time and strength in vain efforts to find true wisdom in such misty bogs. Now one who knows, and can testify from experience, assures us that even Hegel has been mocking his devotees with a shadow with "an endless, aimless process of development," which with all its supercilious pretensions to logic and philosophy is "illogical and self-contradictory."

By this strong commendation of Dr. Christlieb's book, we do not mean to endorse all his views. "Call no man master." But so far as we have examined the work, it has given us great satisfaction, and afforded much comfort and encouragement. It should be in the hands of every minister and intelligent layman, and must, under God, accomplish much good. Besides, it is cheap, for a book of its size (549 pp. 8vo.) as are all the publications of the Tract Society.

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

CHURCH NEWS.—The following items were laid over from July :

*Some Notes on the Recent Meeting of the Classis.*—The Classis of Philadelphia met in St. Matthew's Church, Chester county, (Rev. M. Rowland's charge) on June 5, and was very pleasantly entertained by the hospitable members of the congregations. The attendance was full, and the meeting a very satisfactory one throughout. Of course as the friends of the high-church party are greatly in the minority (even since the withdrawal of our German brethren) something



said and done in the natural course of events are not to their taste. It seems to be especially disagreeable to them having matters exposed which are elsewhere covered over, and to have facts divulged which are elsewhere hushed up. But Philadelphia Classis believing in letting all the people know the whole truth in regard to the present disturbance of our Church by the schemes of the high-church party. Classes and Synods in which that party sways the votes, may indulge in denunciations of the earnest efforts made by those who love their Church more than any school or erratic theological leaders of any school, Philadelphia Classis (both German and English) rather arrays itself against the revolutionizing innovations, and firmly stands by the Old Evangelical Reformed faith and practice.

One thing, however, may be affirmed, that this Classis has never used its power in any arbitrary and unrighteous assaults upon the persons of the minority. It has never manufactured false accusations against any of them out of forced occasions as an excuse for stigmatizing them with arbitrary and unjust censures. And there is no reason to fear that it ever will. Even though a paper is published within its bounds, and edited by one of its members, which often contains articles which must be justly offensive to all who are truly Reformed in their faith, and which are open to merited condemnation, the liberal spirit of the Classis has thus far led it to endure the evil, rather than even seem to interfere with personal freedom.

The following is the action taken by Philadelphia Classis, in regard to Ursinus College:

"The Annual Catalogue of Ursinus College exhibits a measure of prosperity over which the Classis has special reason to rejoice. It is particularly gratifying that the Theological Department is rendering such efficient service. As a due expression of our interest in the Institution, we submit for adoption, the following action:

"*Resolved*, That this Classis approves of the present organization of Ursinus College in its several departments, and of the relations sustained and positions filled by members of this Classis in the College, and sanctions the services rendered in those positions.

"*Resolved*, That we warmly commend Ursinus College to the favor and patronage of all our ministers, congregations and members."

This action of Classis, we regret to notice, is wholly omitted in the Clerk's published report of the proceedings in the *Messenger*. Of this omission the Classis has just reason to complain. The action was *unanimously adopted*, and entitled to consideration. Such an omission could hardly have been accidental. Philadelphia Classis has as good a right to be heard by the Church as any other, and will scarcely consent to an unfair abridgment of its rights.

*The Classis of Lancaster, Pa.*, seems to acquiesce in the *letter* of the decision of the General Synod of Cincinnati. It levies no specified amount for *benevolent* objects, such as supporting beneficiaries at Lancaster, etc., but it lays an *enormous assessment* for nominally classical and synodical fund purposes. In some cases this amounts to nearly \$100, or even more, perhaps, for a single congregation or charge. Rightly to judge of the greatness of such an assessment, it must be remembered that the amount usually asked from each charge varied from about \$10 to \$15 and \$20. This would of course realize an abundance for strictly classical purposes. By the Lancaster assessment the Classis would therefore get five, or, possibly, ten times more money than can be needed for classical expenses proper.

*What becomes of the surplus?* Is it divided between beneficiary education, etc.? Does the Classis take this way of making congregations not in sympathy

with the new order revolution aid in supporting it and its institutions? If this be so, the measure is as unfair and disingenuous as some other things done in that quarter, and we would advise our brethren of the good old Reformed faith, to submit not for a day to any such scheme. Find out from the minutes of the General and District Synods the assessment upon your Classis for properly synodical purposes; add a fair amount for classical purposes; reckon out what share would fairly fall to each congregation or charge; promptly pay that, say \$10 or \$15. For the rest respectfully inform the Classis that you decline to pay it, claiming the right to give your benevolent contributions to such objects as you prefer. And let no threats of ecclesiastical penalties frighten you into violating your conscience for fear of such penalties.

The Classis of *Mercersburg* and of *East Pennsylvania* appear to go about the matter more boldly. In direct defiance of the General Synod, the former took action, ordering charges in arrears for assessments for benevolent objects to pay up without delay. In the same spirit *East Pennsylvania Classis* took like mandatory action in regard to certain delinquents, enjoining immediate attention to the matter. More certainly to secure obedience, this Classis has issued official letters to those delinquents, couched in exceedingly positive terms, and seeming to involve some ominous insinuations. We had the pleasure of reading one of these official epistles, and were quite entertained by its lofty tone. On being asked for advice in the case, our unhesitating counsel was: very respectfully acknowledge its receipt, and very respectfully beg to be excused from complying with its demand. That is what we would do, and feel justified in doing, under the Gospel, under our Constitution, and by the express decision of the General Synod. But suppose the Classis should charge one with insubordination or contumacy, what then? Why, simply, so much the worse for the Classis under the circumstances—with the Constitution and the General Synod against them; nay, with the indignant sentiment of all candid and intelligent Christians against them. There is, however, not much danger of *East Pennsylvania Classis* hazarding such an experiment. Some of its members, we regret to say, seem to have wrong views enough, or some points to incline them to extreme measures in pressing their high-church schemes. But even they know that they are in *East Pennsylvania*. And we know enough of our Church in Northampton county, and in Lehigh county, to assert confidently, that if certain brethren there, under the impulse of high-church principles, attempt to force certain things, their official relations will continue no longer than it may take the people to find out the facts in the case. Those people are heart and soul Reformed, which means that they are soul and heart opposed to the theory and practice of the *Mercersburg-Lancaster* schemes; and the brethren know this as well as we do.

The *Board of Home Missions* of the North West Synod at a recent meeting showed a proper spirit of faith and energy in its work. The Missionary operations of our German brethren in the West are conducted upon true principle of harmony with the Gospel interests of our Church, and are rightly deserving of powerful sympathy and liberal aid. We shall gladly receive and forward any contributions for this object.

The *Rev. Thos. Poulson* has been unanimously (only one dissenting vote), elected successor of *Rev. E. R. Eshbach*, as Pastor of the 1st Reformed Church Baltimore.

*Notes of vacation trips* must be reserved for September, excepting to say in advance, that the cordial recreation attended by many brethren and friends in York, Adams, Northampton and Lehigh counties, was most cheering for our cause, and cordially appreciated.

*Acknowledgments* for contributions will be given in our next issue.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—SEPTEMBER, 1874.—No. 9.

---

SOWING AND REAPING.

"He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him."

The broad dark fields are bare,  
And seed-time waneth fast;  
Where are the laborers for the Lord?  
Speed! ere the time be past.

\* \* \* \*

Weeping he sows his seed  
Over the barren ground,  
Doubting if, at the harvest eve,  
A single sheaf is found.  
The little blade appears  
Beneath the gentle showers,  
And wandering thoughts of future good  
Delight his tedious hours.

The warm and gentle sun  
Sends down his cheering rays,  
And soon the sight of dawning fruit  
Gladden his summer days.

The fields are rich with grain,  
And all his doubts are gone,  
As new and ripening grain appears  
With each returning morn.

But now that gentle sun  
Shines on with scorching heat,  
And withered leaves and parched fruit  
His noontide watches meet.

Saddened by wasted toil  
His weary days wear by,  
And Faith forsakes him as he sees  
His blighted prospects die.

But see! the breezes blow  
Up in the tree-tops tall;  
And look! the sky is overcast,  
And mercy's raindrops fall.

The dry and withered grain  
Lifts up its drooping heads,  
And ere the summer sun has set,  
He tears of gladness sheds.

Far down the harvest fields  
Is heard the reaper's song,  
As homeward, at the twilight's hour,  
They bear the sheaves along.

\* \* \* \*

But still broad fields are bare,  
And seed-time waneth fast;  
Where are the laborers for the Lord?  
Speed! ere the time be past.

—S. S. World.

---

#### THE PRIMITIVE FAITH CONCERNING GOD.

"In the great conflict between faith and unbelief, it is always the idea conceived of *God*, that forms *the inmost care and centre* of every question, and in the case of every individual, gives room (the ruling life) and shape to the whole of his religion, his theoretical convictions, and his practical rules of conduct."

Starting with this positive and undeniable declaration as our motto, or text, we ask, and shall seek to answer the question: *What were primitive Christians taught, and what did they hold as their faith, concerning God?*

*First*, they were taught and held, that *the right knowledge of God and faith in Him was fundamental to true Christianity*. Hence it is so explicitly declared:

"He that cometh unto God must believe that *He is*, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." And again:



"This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent."

Such right knowledge is affirmed not only to be possible, but is placed so nearly within the reach of every one that each and all may secure it. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse," if they do not know Him.

This is an important point, especially in view of efforts made in our day to lead men to think that God, as God, cannot be known by us, or that the knowledge of God and immediate faith in Him are not the first thing in true religion. It is not claimed that such knowledge and faith were exhaustive, or commensurate with the infinite nature of God. But they were real, and true, so far as they went, and were entirely sufficient for the spiritual wants of men.\* And they were considered primary also. For primitive Christians all religion began with God, because His being and nature were most reasonably held to furnish the very first condition of all religion, and were considered the ultimate ground of all religious thoughts, feelings, and acts. Thus, as under the old dispensation, so under the new, the first article, and central starting point of the theology and piety of the people, was *God as God*, the right knowledge of Him, and faith in Him. They held that if *He* was not, there could be no true religion, and, of course, no Christianity; and, consequently, that to know and fear, believe in and love Him, was "the beginning of wisdom."

In the *second* place we can learn from many New Testament passages that the knowledge or conception which primitive Christians had of God, included what are commonly called His *attributes*.

His essential nature they held to be *spiritual* in distinction from everything material, even in its most refined and subtle form. In this respect they rejected all such false notions as that the sub-

---

\* In these articles, at least, intended as they are to be a simple setting forth in a plain, practical way, of the faith of primitive Christians, the pet terms objective and subjective will be avoided. In most cases their use by a certain class of writers is an affectation, and instead of making statements clearer only confuses the mind, by introducing a superfluous qualification.

stance of God was *fire* or *light*, or anything that could be seen or handled by our bodily senses. They accepted the words of Jesus, which declared: "God is a Spirit;" "no *man* hath seen God at any time." "Ye have neither heard His voice nor seen His shape." Hence their faith on this point is expressed in such declarations as that of Paul: "Whom no man hath seen nor can see," because he dwells "in light which no man can approach unto," and is His inmost nature and essence "the King \* \* invisible," that is, not visible to mortal eye.

But this God, who is thus spiritual in His nature, and invisible, who is above all our sensible or sensuous perceptions and apprehensions, is most truly and really a *personal* God. He is not a mere power, or principle, possessing certain infinite attributes which operate in nature and upon nature, as mere power, directing, ordering, producing, shaping, and supporting all things. To the reason and faith of early Christians, God was, on the contrary, a personal being, a *self*, and as such, possessing (or rather being) infinite intelligence, will, and love. "He only hath immortality," is eternal, "from everlasting to everlasting." He hath, in this personal view, all power, "all things are possible to God." He hath infinite wisdom, as "the only wise God our Saviour."

In Himself, as such a God, they held and believed Him to be most holy, just, and God, and, therefore, infinitely "blessed;" so that they could well appreciate the ascriptions of praise rendered unto Him by the heavenly host: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come."

In the *next place*, regarding the *relation of God to the world*, including angels and men, the views and faith of primitive Christians was very clear and definite, in contrast, particularly with the low, carnal and confused notions of surrounding nations.

Above all, we find them maintaining very decidedly the broad difference between God as *Creator*, and other beings as creatures. He, as God, the Creator, is infinitely above all creatures, and essentially distinct from them. "Through faith they understood that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." (Hebrews 11: 3.) The heavens and the earth were not in any sense an emanation from the substance of God, but the product of His *creative* power. Hence, in looking back to the commencement



of their existence, they are expressly called "the creation which God created." (Mark 13: 19.)

Early Christians were equally clear in their views and faith on another kindred point, viz: That creation was *not a necessary act of God*. That is, they did not hold that He was compelled, as it were, by some eternal law of His being superior to Himself, to let His inmost nature go out into such a creation. On the contrary, they looked upon creation as a voluntary, free act of God, as something He was pleased to do, in full accordance with His own infinite and sovereign will. "Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." (Rev. 4: 11.)

Primitive Christians were not ignorant of the opposite views on this subject which prevailed among the Gentiles around them. They knew that some held to a doctrine of a sort of eternal generation from God, or emanation from Him, as the fontal and seminal (seed) substance of all existing things, thus changing "the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man," &c. (Rom. 1: 23.) And many knew that this false notion of the relation of the Creator to the creature was held in varying degrees, from the grossest form of idolatry to the most refined speculations of would-be philosophers. But utterly rejecting all such views as unworthy and false, they clung firmly to the faith which distinctly proclaimed Him the Creator or "maker of heaven and earth," and as in no sense mixed up with them in His being, or as imparting to them any part of His own essential nature or substance.

In like manner did they hold the doctrine of God's *providential* relation to the world (including intelligent creatures) and government over it. This relation was so close and intimate that it extended to the birds of the air and the lilies of the field. "Not a sparrow could fall to the ground" without His will. He "clothed the grass of the field." "The very hairs of our head are numbered" by Him. (Matt. 10: 29, 30; 6: 26, 30). They held, therefore, that in Him all "lived and moved and had their being."

How this could be without the existence of some substantial connection, some "organic conjunction" between God and the creature so constantly dependent upon Him, our primitive brethren might not be able to explain. This, however, gave them no concern. As they knew and believed in God, it was not only

possible and necessary that He should by His omnipresent wisdom, power and goodness, thus sustain all things continually, and supply their need, but it was also possible for Him to do it, and yet maintain His infinite, essential distinction from them, and superiority over them. Hence, they most carefully and scrupulously distinguished between the fowls of the air and the flowers of the field, which He made, and fed, and "arrayed in glory," and the only living and true God to whom they owed their being and preservation. And no less carefully did they maintain a like distinction between God and the highest order of creation, whether angels or men. Though they knew that the former were called in some eminent sense "the sons of God," the phrase did not mislead them into the false conclusion, that they were such in a sense literally corresponding with the human relation of parent and child. Even the highest archangels were still as really creatures distinct from the Creator as were the birds and creeping things of the earth. And though they held, according to the Scriptures, that "man became a living soul" by God "breathing into his nostrils the breath of life," and "making man in his own image," they maintained that this "breathing" was as truly and literally a *creative* act, as when "the Lord said, let there be light, and there was light."

They would as soon have thought of "falling down before the host of heaven and worshiping them," because the Psalmist had said, in sacred song, that "they declare His glory," and were "created by the breath of his mouth," as of holding that either angels or men were emanations from God, and made of His substance, because the Scriptures declared that man became "a living soul" by God breathing into him the breath of life, or that "we are His offspring," as one of the heathen poets sang (though in a wholly different sense from that in which Paul made the quotation).

From what has thus far been stated, it is evident that the God of the early Church (that is, of Christians), "is neither the God of deism nor of pantheism. His personal existence, as infinitely exalted above all creatures, is firmly maintained. He is our Father, but our Father in heaven. He maintains the most intimate providential relation to His creatures, especially to those who intelligently realize their dependence upon Him; but still



maintains His (supra-mundane) exaltation, as God, above them. He made what He created, not under the irresistible impulse of some law of His being more potent than Himself, but because of His own sovereign pleasure, He chose, for His own glory, to do so. So that we find the primitive Christian idea of God not only rising above that of profane heathenism, but even above that also of Judaism, especially as then prevailing."

*(To be continued.)*

---

SELECTIONS ON FAITH.

MAN originally fell by losing his confidence in God, and can only be raised by the restoration of his confidence: in other words, unbelief was his ruin, and he now stands by faith.

Faith in Christ is that act of the mind by which we apprehend Christ as He is revealed to us in the word of truth. It is the act of the heart, or affections, by which we heartily welcome Him into our souls; and it is the act of the will, by which we cordially submit to Him, and render cheerful obedience to His laws.

Faith's province is to unite the soul unto Christ; and when that end is accomplished, its office is fulfilled. Yet men are apt to think of it as something altogether different from this—as something in itself so vital, that instead of shutting them up into Christ, they allow it to interpose between them, and thereby they frustrate the very object it is intended to serve.

To believe only in proportion to our narrow conceptions, is to disparage the divine truth and debase the divine power. We cannot know what God can do. He is omnipotent, though we are not omniscient: 'tis just that we should humble our ignorance to his wisdom. 'Tis our wisdom to receive the great mysteries of the gospel in their simplicity: for in attempting to give an exact and curious explication of them, the understanding, as in a hedge of thorns, the more it strives, the more 'tis wounded and entangled.

Beware of starving your faith by neglecting to lay in proper provision. Faith comes by hearing, and hearing the word of God. That is the only sustenance for faith; and what the word holds forth and conveys through faith into the heart, viz., the grace of God in Christ, is the only support of the soul. "Wherefore, as new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby. And let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all knowledge and spiritual understanding." It is the Spirit of Christ, indeed, which alone can kindle and maintain this divine flame; but it is the Christian's business to lay the fuel ready.

A doctor who was once visiting a Christian patient, had himself been anxious to feel that he was at peace with God; the Spirit of God had convinced him of sin and need, and he longed to possess "that peace which the world cannot give." On this occasion, addressing himself to the sick one, he said, "I want you just to tell me what it is, this believing and getting happiness—faith in Jesus, and all that sort of thing that brings peace." His patient replied, "Doctor, I have felt that I could do nothing, and I have put my case in your hands; I am trusting in you. This is exactly what every poor sinner must do in the Lord Jesus." The reply greatly awakened the doctor's surprise, and a new light broke in on his soul. "Is that all?" he exclaimed, "simply trusting in the Lord Jesus. I see it as I never did before. He has done the work." Yes, Jesus said on the cross, "It is finished." And "whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life." From that sick bed the doctor went a happy man, rejoicing that his sins were washed away in the blood of the Lamb.

SHOW YOUR FAITH BY YOUR WORKS.—An enthusiastic citizen called his neighbors together and delivered a railroad speech. He spoke very fluently for an hour or more, on the advantages of having a railroad in their midst, and earnestly solicited them to take liberal stock in it. When he was done, he gave a piece of blank paper to Uncle John Smith, who was always ready to officiate on such occasions, telling him to present it to all in the house for their names and the amount each one desired to subscribe to the enterprise. Accordingly, Uncle John canvassed the entire assembly, but soon returned to the speaker with his subscription paper almost as blank as it was when he started out with it. He



got but three subscribers. "What!" says the speaker, and is that all?" "Yes," replied Uncle John. "What did they say?" inquired the former. "Why," they said, "Go into it yourself." The speaker snatched the paper, and wrote, "Samuel Brown, \$500," and started the paper again. Very soon the subscription returned quite full of names and figures. The money was raised, but not until Samuel Brown showed his faith by his works.

---

WHAT IS IT?

MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY! Yes. What *is* Mercersburg Theology? No one has as yet appeared who claims to be authenticated to answer this oft-repeated question. The mystery still lies hidden with the initiated few, and they persist now as ever to talk enigmatically—that is, say one thing and deny they mean it—say another and declare you do not understand them. It has been our business, week after week, to look into the "Department of Theology and Criticism" in the *Mittelman's Messenger*, to find an answer to our question, but remain as hopelessly befogged as ever. The hope that it might be permitted us to live until this mystery is solved, recedes rapidly, and it does appear as if this generation must die without seeing an authenticated setting-forth of the now notorious theology. The system of theology whose *life element* is the Heidelberg Catechism, framed for catechumens and the parochial schools, should be intelligible to almost any one—a system based on "the Creed" and that creed the confession of converts fresh from heathenism, should not require so great intellectual power for its understanding. It was also to be supposed that if Proctor could *so* teach the attractions and revolutions of the stellar world, that a popular audience could comprehend what he read; or if Huxley could *so* illustrate the laws of light as to make them intelligible to a lecture audience; or that Dr. Hodge could teach all the depths of old-fashioned Westminster Calvinism, so that no one misapprehends his meaning, that surely the Mercersburg-Lancaster Professors *could* simplify the outlines of this wonderful and wonder-working theology of *their*

creation. Do not call us dull and stupid again until this is done for the weak and uninitiated. Maybe the authors of this theological sphinx look upon it as Jacob Böhmen did his Aurora—"that its mysteries are intended to be, and will remain, incomprehensible to all *common* mortals who are not gifted with special inspiration," and perhaps be safe were they to follow Lycophron, surnamed Tenebrosus, who publicly announced that he would hang himself if he found any person who could understand his single poem (*Alexandra*, notorious for its obscurity). However this may be, assuming that it does treat *something*, and that those involved and contradictory utterances from the Mercersburg oracle have a meaning, we inquire of those who can, and of whom it is admitted that they do, understand—*Does Mercersburg Theology make the Heidelberg Catechism the formal basis of all its teachings, and maintain and defend the same?* This is a very trite question, and it matters not what others say or even believe; all we ask is a categorical answer. We mean, of course, this Catechism in its historic sense, as it was understood by its framers and accepted by the Church. There is no more in a creed or confession than was put into it, and was accepted as being in it, by those who adopted it. It cannot be added to or taken from; for the Reformed Church it is a complete symbol. If the Church outgrows the Catechism, if its scientific theology expands beyond the limits of the Catechism, then it must altar it or frame a more advanced and complete one for its own age. It never has been charged against the Fathers of the Reformed Church in these United States that they were heretics, that they did not teach the doctrines of the Reformed Church in their historic sense. It is not even alleged that those who filled the pulpits of *our* Reformed Church at the time of Dr. Nevin's advent, did not hold and honestly teach the true doctrine of the Catechism. While much has been written in laudation of Cyprianism, of Fritschelism, and various other *un*-Reformed doctrines, while the Palatinate Liturgy has been declared jejune, etc., no assault has been made on the dead heroes who laid the foundation of our part of the Reformed Church. We are young no longer; our recollections antedate this calamitous period, and we never heard in the pulpit or in catechizing, that which all did not hold to be "echt Reformirt" doctrine. If the theology of the Reformed Church was in sound accord with the Catechism, if its pulpits inculcated this doctrine,



if its youth were instructed in them, and if the Church held faithfully to them, then where is the room for all this glorification of Mercersburg Theology? What is new or good in it that was not in the Catechism, and that the people did not hear from the pulpit and cherish in their hearts? If it be such an admirable discovery—something so wondrous in its effects, so surpassingly grand—did not the Church possess it as a golden treasure? This excessive laudation of Mercersburg Theology is known to all; it is heralded to the world as a *production* of Dr. Nevin, and “the rest of us.” Our “authorized periodicals” have worn all the ordinary and extraordinary term of glorification threadbare. Every fledgling priest manipulated at Mercersburg or Lancaster, as he passes through his parish, uses his tiny tin trumpet, elaborately ornamented, with great aptness and fervor in sounding the pance of Mercersburg Theology as something recent—as a new panacea, until the people were led to believe that it was new and better than the *old* Reformed doctrines of its Fathers. And thus there has been tooting and tooting with trumpets of every shape and material, while many of these buglers to their own music marched to Rome; something the old Reformed doctrine of the Catechism never was used for.

Now, was all this humbug? Was it an extensive sham? Dressing up the precious old theology of the historic Catechism in a *new* dress of unusual and pretentious words—words sounding loud and meaning nothing—thereby to attract attention to “our institution,” and to fix the gaze of the crowd on the wondrous star whose eccentric orbit would keep it in view as the light of American Scientific Theology. Can it be that this was all that was meant, and no more?

At Mercersburg and Lancaster have all the doctors and elite of the church, as they esteem themselves, year after year reprinted Cyprian—excerpted from German folios and studied a strange nomenclature and practiced involved phrases, only that the old, sound, Reformed theology, amid the novelty and noise, should become the meteor of an hour? Was our previous old faith thus tricked out in order to play a Yankee (Puritan) trick on the world, and so well done that some dull heads have not discovered the fun or the reality under this theological sham? Certainly the churches have been assured all the while that the uncertain and dubious sounds issuing from Mercersburg were undoubtedly

genuine Reformed utterances, in full accord with the Catechism. In part, the confiding people believe it. Did any hapless rationalist, relying on his eyes, ears and reason, except to such theology as had the endorsement of Mercersburg, he was petrified by a sneer, and denounced as a Puritan rationalist or devil. But, after all, it is resolved into this: If Mercersburg theology is in harmony with the historic meaning of the Heidelberg Catechism, then there is nothing new—no discovery in it. And all the pretensions set up for it are a sham—the church has been deluded. And this trick has been gotten up by grave and reverend sons of the church. *Can this estimate of the case be true?* Only one other solution can be imagined, and that is, that this Mercersburg enigma is a *novelty* in theology so far as it can be called a system; is a parti-colored affair, made up of patches picked up along the track of past ages, from the errors and fancies that were cast off and moulded into a so-called philosophical form, while the authors had not courage to set it out definitely and to avow that it was new, claiming all the while for it a Reformed character of the strictest kind. It has bewildered the churches—they are like old blind Isaac: “The voice is Jacob’s voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau.” In either case a wrong has been perpetrated on the Reformed church. It is no extenuation of this wrong to assert, that the Mercersburg novelties are better—an advance on the old *jejune* faith of the church. It is not right to do evil, to mislead or deceive, that good may come. By universal consent the miracle-mongers of the Romish church have been condemned for their impositions on the credulity of an ignorant and bigoted people. Is it less blameworthy to palm off on a church as the historic doctrine of its creed, that which is foreign to its very life, under specious phrases and ambiguous formularies. Is it less blameworthy to make believe in wonderful discoveries in scientific theology—to parade as something new and progressive that which is only a homely old acquaintance, tricked out in a new dress of strange words? If there be nothing in Mercersburg theology but what was in the Catechism, then it is an *imposition*. If there be taught in it that which was not in the Catechism, then it is a *fraud*. The teachings of the Mercersburg and Lancaster Professors *cannot* honestly be more or less than the measure of the historic Catechism. Be these oracular utterances, that are so much of a puzzle, either more or less than this, they involve a



wrong to the confidence of the churches—a wrong in the conduct of those pledged to teach, maintain and defend these doctrines, as stated and accepted in this venerable Confession. Under any aspect this is a painful case. It involves the destruction of those moral bonds that usually bind man to man by covenants. Recently, in the Episcopal church, some have gone out of her because they could not teach the doctrine of her Book of Common Prayer. Some have left the Reformed church and gone to Rome because they could not defend and maintain the historic Heidelberg Catechism. Here is predominant a *sense* of honor. Whatever our judgment may be of the correctness of the conclusion in these cases, we are constrained to affirm the honesty. It is matter of regret that such has not been the cause in all similar cases. It would have left us an *undivided* house. Our communion would not be troubled about what is Mercersburg theology. It could have no existence in any church, had vows been kept—had even honor held supremacy in the conscience.

ULRIC.

POLITICAL AGGRESSIONS OF THE PAPACY.

SPEECH BY DR. DUFF.

DR. DUFF made a great speech lately on taking the chair at the annual meeting of the Scottish Reformation Society. We give an extract :

“Of late much has been said and written about the temporal power of the Pope. Now, what is meant by this temporal power? Many, I find, are apt hastily and inconsiderately to conclude that it denotes merely his civil power as sovereign over the States of the Church, which is now lost by the absorption of these States into the kingdom of Italy. If this were all, it were comparatively a small and harmless matter. But this is so far from being all, that it is scarcely the thing at all. A brief statement of facts may best serve to indicate what is really meant. As far back as the sixth and seventh centuries, Romish prelates throughout Europe began in many ways to mix temporal with spiritual jurisdic-

tion; and this incongruous mixture of things, temporal and spiritual, or things ecclesiastical and secular, proved, as might be expected, highly detrimental to religion. In the eighth century they carried their insolent encroachments on the civil power still further. In the coronation of monarchs, they came to occupy the chief place, and by that ceremony they pretended to bestow on the king his kingdom, and that, too, by an authority which they professed to have derived from God. They also began to assume the right of sitting in judgment on civil rulers in their own ecclesiastical councils, and if they proved refractory, of deposing them. In the case of certain royal but timid superstitious weaklings, this was literally done; and the kings, with bowed down and craven spirits, actually submitted to the gross indignity and humiliation. In other cases, however, where they had manlier natures to deal with, there was a stout and stubborn resistance to such ignominious treatment. At length the Pope, looking out from his lofty eyrie in the seven-hilled city, with envious and jealous eyes on the usurping proclivities of his underling prelates, not unnaturally concluded that he himself had fully as much right as any or all of them put together to regulate the affairs of sovereign princes, not by way of proffered friendly mediation and counsel, but of autocratic plenipotentiary authority—even to the extent of summarily disposing of their crowns and sceptres, or giving and taking away their temporal dominions. In the eleventh century this increasingly ambitious disposition on the part of the Popes, attained its climax when the celebrated Hildebrand was made Pope, under title of Gregory III. Of him it has been truly said, that he was the first who completely “subverted all the ancient privileges of kings and princes, of councils and bishops, of clergy and laity, and established the dominion of the Pope as king of kings and lord of lords.” He did not hesitate fearlessly to proclaim his paramount right as head of the church and successor of Peter, for whom he impiously claimed all power in heaven and on earth; to create kings, by investing them with royal title and dignity; to pronounce judicial sentence upon princes as vassals of the Church of Rome, who, as such, were bound to take the oath of fealty, and humbly render to her due homage and tribute; as well as his paramount right, in the last resort, to dethrone all sovereigns who might persist in contumacy and rebellion against her divine and infallible authority. This latter right he based



chiefly on his plenary power of excommunication. Now, let it be borne in mind, that an excommunicated person was placed under a ban, and became simply an outlaw from all society—to be studiously shunned as a moral plague or pestilence—his wishes or commands to be utterly disregarded—all intercourse with him to be rigorously interdicted, and himself to be contumeliously treated and scornfully abandoned by the whole world.

In this way he literally dealt with no less a personage than the Emperor of Germany, whom he excommunicated and thereby deposed—declaring his throne vacant, absolving his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and imperiously commanding them to choose another in his stead; thus distracting and filling his dominion with sedition and tumults, strifes, contention, and bloody wars. And in the following century other Popes, imitating his example, and arrogating the same temporal supremacy over the governments and kingdoms of the earth, enacted a precisely similar part towards other monarchs and States, with precisely similar disastrous results. Of this daring and blasphemous claim of the Popes to be absolute lords and proprietors of the whole world, we find, towards the close of the fifteenth century, some notable and striking illustrations. When Columbus, for example, returned to Spain after his famous discovery of western realms of fabled wealth, the Spanish sovereigns, though greatly elated by the glowing prospects thus opened up to them, and burning with intense desire to take immediate possession of the dazzling prize, durst not venture to do so till they had first humbly asked and obtained leave from their supreme lord and proprietor, the Pope. On being formally applied to for this end, his Holiness, with unbounded generosity, was generously pleased to grant his Royal petitioners a free gift of all countries already discovered, or to be discovered, lying west of a certain named meridian—including, of course, the whole of the West India Islands, with North and South America! In like manner, not long afterwards, when the Pope was similarly applied to by the king of Portugal, a free gift was made to him of all the countries already discovered, or to be discovered, east of a certain named meridian—including, of course, all Africa, Asia, the Indian Archipelago, and Australia—while at the same time he graciously conferred on the king the magnificent title of “Lord of the navigation, conquests, and trade of Ethiopia, Arabia, Persia, and India”—a title still retained by

his royal successors. Here, surely, was a marvelous exercise of the usurped temporal power of the Popes, on a scale of stupendous world-wide magnitude! Soon, however, was to be verified the sacred adage of pride going before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall. Amid the accession and display of these high-handed prerogatives, the Reformation suddenly burst upon Europe with the upheaving force of an earthquake—in some countries shattering the colossal fabric of the Papacy into pieces, dealing heavy blows and discouragement to it in others, and greatly lowering its prestige and authority in all. No wonder that the proud tyrant of the Vatican should be exasperated beyond measure when he descried millions of once crouching and cowering devotees, now treating his baseless and impious pretensions with derisive scorn. No wonder that his bosom should be surcharged with a redundancy of bile and chagrin that could only find vent for itself in a succession of angry bulls and cursing anathemas which, though fulminated with all the old volcanic rage, fell on the newly-awakened and resuscitated manhood of the nations like the dash and froth and spray of the foaming billow, as it furiously breaks on the solid rock that bounds the ocean's shore, and soon sinks down into impotent exhaustion at its unshaken base. Now, it is the exorbitant temporal power and ascendancy thus partially lost in some lands at the time of the Reformation, and wholly so in others, which the Popes have ever since been striving with might and main to recover and reassert in all. It is the arrogant and overbearing claim to this temporal power and ascendancy, under its new name of Ultramontaniam, which the noble Emperor William and his grand Oliver Cromwell-like Chancellor Bismarck (applause) have of late been so strenuously resisting in their beloved Fatherland. And unless we soon learn to shut our ears to the plausible lies of Jesuitism and Jesuit-inspired Romish priests and prelates, and wholly repudiate the temporizing schemes of a spurious and hollow Liberalism, this is the arrogant and overbearing claim to temporal power and ascendancy which, through the cowardice, treachery, or ignorance of rulers in Church and State, our children or grandchildren may have yet to resist, and that, too, it may be, like our heroic forefathers, at the rekindled stakes and reërected scaffolds of martyrdom.—*Christian Statesmen.*



GERHART ON BAPTISM, IN THE COUNTRY PAPERS.

IN the pleasant village of Waynesboro', Pa., they have a weekly paper, the "*Village Record*," in which the confused and erroneous views of Dr. Gerhart on Baptism have been discussed by two writers, one of whom (H. H. W. H.) stands firmly on the old Reformed ground, while the other ("Justitia") tries hard to defend Dr. Gerhart. "Justitia" is said to be Dr. Higbee, but this must certainly be a mistake, since Dr. H., with all his ultraisms, would not pen such absurdities as *Justitia* prints. The way in which he comes to the defence of Dr. G., must lead the latter to exclaim *in agony*, "*Save me from my friends.*" But there is in it something so instructive for Dr. G., if he will only lay it to heart, that we are induced to refer to it for the benefit both of our readers and Dr. Gerhart.

The following extract from the first article of Justitia, is decidedly the richest thing that has yet appeared in this controversy.

"The following, however, challenges attention. Quotation from the article :

*Dr. Gerhart in Tract No. 3.*

In holy baptism grace is the same divine life of Christ given by the new-creating power of the Holy Spirit to those who are by nature dead in sin, *in that by baptism they are engrafted into Jesus Christ and are thereby made partakers of Christ and all His benefits.* . . . . There is no external washing with water without the internal washing with the Spirit.

*Dr. Gerhart in Messenger.*

All the benefits of Christ are received, that is, appropriated, by us, and thus made our own, *not by baptism*, not in the way of any sacramental transaction, but by personal faith, and by the exercise of personal faith exclusively."

Now, Mr. Editor, here is a flat contradiction. No more flat, however, than unscrupulous persons often make out of the Bible itself. Without attempting a refutation of this garbled quotation, it will be sufficient to say, that Dr. Gerhart is regarded, in his own church and outside of it, as an educated, intelligent man, and withal not a mean theologian. And to offer these quotations, as they are made, side by side, to the readers of the *Record*, or anywhere else, with the hope of having them to be believed, requires belief in their ignorance which is decidedly cool. Besides this, the theological seminary in which Dr. Gerhart is a professor and a teacher, is directly under the oversight of a Board of Visitors,

whose duty it is to attend the examinations at the close of every session, and to guard sacredly its orthodoxy. Only think of it! That Board, in this view, must be easily duped if Dr. Gerhart could be so contradictory, and that on one of the vital doctrines taught in "H.'s" Catechism, if he studies it. Is it at all presumable that such palpable contradictions could have place, either in his teaching or his writing? To say so, in your paper, or to say it in any paper, is simply an insult to the intelligence of the readers of other papers."

So far "Justitia." Now, let the reader observe :

1. That the above extracts, in parallel columns, are genuine and correct quotations from Dr. Gerhart's writings: so virtually confessed by Dr. Gerhart himself in late articles in the *Messenger*; and which any one can verify for himself by sending to Dr. Fisher for Tract No. 3 and the *Messenger*.

2. Dr. Gerhart does not like to admit that these two passages contradict each other, and has written a long series of theological and critical articles in the *Messenger*, to prove that they are consistent with each other: to prove that what is stated in the first column is entirely true, and so also that what is stated in the second column is equally true. However, we must say, in justice to Justitia, that these articles have appeared since Justitia has taken the field to vindicate Dr. Gerhart.

3. And such a vindication and defence!! "Save me from my friends," must certainly have been the groaning of Dr. G. For,

(1.) Justitia admits at the very start, "Now, Mr. Editor, here is a *flat contradiction*." Justitia, educated in the advanced philosophy and theology of Mercersburg, pronounces the two to be "a flat contradiction." However, in this he just as "flatly" contradicts Dr. Gerhart, who now stoutly avers that they are not a contradiction. Dr. G. now affirms that none but unchurchly and spiritualistic persons will find a contradiction in his sentences. So, then, according to Dr. Gerhart, our friend "Justitia" must be unchurchly and spiritualistic.

But Justitia is quite right in this respect. The two propositions are a "flat contradiction," and "contradictory opposites" of each other; and this is the judgment of the whole church, so far as we have been able to ascertain it, and we believe that Dr. Gerhart himself has been made to feel that his doctrine of baptism is a melancholy specimen of a new theory of baptism; just as most



of the peculiar views of Mercersburg are melancholy specimens of "theology and criticism."

(2.) But Justitia goes further. He holds that these quotations cannot possibly be genuine quotations from Dr. Gerhart (but why did he not refer to the Tract and *Messenger*; he could have seen at a glance that they are both genuine and ungarbled) for a variety of reasons. These are the great reasons:

a. Dr. Gerhart is "an educated, intelligent man." So, then, according to Justitia, if these extracts are genuine, it will follow that Dr. Gerhart is not "intelligent."

b. "Dr. Gerhart is Professor in the Theological Seminary, and is directly under the oversight of a Board of Visitors whose duty it is to attend the examinations at the close of every session, and to guard sacredly its orthodoxy." And now he solemnly proceeds, "Only think of it! *That Board, in this view, must be easily duped if Dr. Gerhart could be so contradictory.*" This turns out to be a very poor defence of Dr. Gerhart, but a rather heavy blow at the poor Board of Visitors.

Now if there is any force in this foolish argument, which has been played upon a number of times in the *Messenger*, it will follow, that since these extracts are actually the teachings of Dr. Gerhart, and since he has recently defended both of them at large in the *Messenger*, the Board of Visitors will no longer allow themselves to be "duped" by his contradictory utterances, on one of the vital doctrines, and Justitia will be one of the first to urge the Board to purge itself in this respect. If he does not, he will show that he made use of an argument in which he has no confidence himself. All this shows how very little there is in the argument lately brought forward by Dr. Gerhart himself, that the Mercersburg theology must be all right, because the Board of Visitors is satisfied. It shows, too, with what flimsy forms of argument such men as Justitia are satisfied.

c. Again, Dr. Gerhart cannot possibly be the author of these extracts, because it is not within the bounds of rational presumption that he could be. Justitia asks, "Is it at all presumable that such palpable contradictions could have place, either in his teaching or writing? To say so in your paper, or to say it in any paper, is an insult to the intelligence of the readers of other papers." So, then, what is utterly unpresumable to the mind of Justitia, turns out to be a hard fact. He has

proven that Dr. Gerhart cannot be the author of these extracts, *and yet he is confessedly their author, and still defends both of them.*

We would add yet, that Justitia was replied to in the *Village Record* with overwhelming force and effort by "H. H. W. H."

HEIDELBERG.

---

#### BETRAYING WITH A KISS.

THIS title will at once call up the dark, sad case of treacherous Judas. It is not, however, *his* heinous sin which is to engage attention in the present article. That sin may be regarded as a sad type or pattern of a large class of acts similar to it in spirit, and even in form, though not so fearfully aggravated in their character and effects.

If it is asked what was the real inner nature of the wicked act of Judas, what was the matter of his offence? the answer must be, it was betraying the person and cause of the Redeemer under the pretence of love for him and ardent devotion to that cause. Judas nominally held to Jesus, outwardly followed Him, professed devotion to Him, even in the very act of treachery acknowledged Him as Master, saying, Hail Master, and formally sealed this all by kissing Him in the presence of a multitude of people.

Now this same sin has often been perpetrated against the truth and cause of Jesus, and it has been done by those who have solemnly disclaimed such an offence, and who may not have been considered guilty of it. Indeed, it has been the misfortune of truth and the cause of truth in all ages, to suffer such gross wrong from professing friends.

The very first assault upon truth was made under this treacherous guise. When Satan sought to pervert the mind and heart of Eve, did he avow himself as opposed to the primitive creed of Eden? Did he declare hostility to the theology of the unwritten Catechism of Paradise? Not he. He was far too shrewd a sophist for that. Adam and Eve may have been but young disci-



ples, and not very thoroughly indoctrinated in the great truths of godliness, but their hearts were right, and their heads were yet clear, and any direct attempt to assail their faith or to persuade them to abandon it as false, injurious and absurd, would doubtless have failed to mislead them.

Hence the enemy adopted a different policy. He concealed his hostility to God and truth under the guise of friendship. He kissed the truth he meant to kill. So far from seeming to be opposed to that truth, he pretended to wish to serve it, by correcting what he quietly assumed to be wrong views of it. His plea amounted to this : God has taught you so and so. You have taken His words in such and such a sense. Are you sure that you have correctly understood what God told you? Taken literally, and according to their sound, they may seem to signify that. But surely that cannot be their real import. Such a meaning is contrary to sound philosophy, and even contrary to reason and to right. In fact, it is inconsistent with just views of God. You have evidently mistaken the whole matter. Listen to me, and I will teach you a better sense, &c.

The sad result is known. But the case, as now considered, furnishes the first mournful illustration of how error betrays truth with a kiss. Whilst reaching forth the right hand in friendship, it pierces the heart of truth with the dagger held in the left.

This, in one view, is the history of all the idolatries of ancient times into which mankind was seduced. They were far from being openly arrayed against the true worship of the true God, from which they successively degenerated. On the contrary, each pretended to be, and tried to prove itself to be, a most faithful servant or handmaid of pure religion. Each claimed to be the product of the most profound wisdom and philosophy, and to lead its devotees in the only safe way of light and truth. Fools, as their great founders and teachers were, they yet put on great airs of wisdom. Whilst subverting every foundation of godliness, they still proclaimed themselves, boastfully, to be the only philosophers who ever fully understood religion, and the only apostles who ever truly taught its mysteries.

It was thus that Aaron's *calf* was set up and worshiped in the wilderness. That golden calf was not to *supplant* God or his worship. By no means. How could a thought of doing any such wicked thing have come into the minds or hearts of the *elders of*

*Israel*, or have for a moment been tolerated by *Aaron*, at the very foot of Sinai, and whilst *Moses* was in communion with God in the Mount? The molten calf of *Aaron* was no more intended to supplant the true worship of God among the tribes of the Lord then, than the setting up of images of Mary and saints in houses of worship called Christian churches, or what virtually amounts to the same thing, the setting up of visible altars as objects towards which the adoring eyes of the people are to be devoutly directed, are *now* meant to divert the homage of the heart from the Creator to the creature. When they "*kissed the calves*," (Hos. 13 : 2), was it not done, avowedly, to honor God, and as a sort of symbolic means to help them the better to honor Him ; just as in our day the use of similar aids is defended upon like grounds? And yet we know what came of it. We know also what must always come of the use of similar deceitful devices.

The case of *Solomon's* idolatries supplies another striking illustration of our subject. Of course, a man so well instructed, so wise and learned as *Solomon*, so profound a philosopher and theologian, would not embrace or introduce outright, gross idolatry. Only he thought it would add so much to the impressiveness and attraction of the Lord's house to have a few finely painted or carved images and statues in it. Why should the heathen have all the beauties of art, those powerful means of appeal to "the æsthetical side of our nature?" Surely, *Jehovah* was more worthy of being honored by such trophies of human talent, taste, and genius, than *Baal* or *Dagon*, than *Jupiter* or *Apollo*. Then, too, by a little accommodation of *Israelitish* worship to that of the idolatrous nations around, many of the latter might be won over to the Lord's side. Thus *Solomon* opened the temple to idols, because he loved Him so, to whom they were an abomination! To honor and adorn God's holy temple, he defiled it with the vilest pollutions, with spiritual harlotry. He betrayed his Creator's creed and cultus with a kiss.

Passing over other illustrations supplied by the history of the Jewish church, there is one brought out to view by our Lord, in His rebuke of the Scribes and Pharisees of that day.

It is well known that they professed high veneration for *Moses*, and the law given through him. For every tradition they advocated, and for all the errors they taught, they claimed the authority of *Moses*. In their seeming intense zeal for *Moses*, as they



apprehended or explained his sayings, they were ever ready to employ the most extreme measures against any who might hold other views. Moses could have no rival in Israel, if they could prevent it.

And yet Jesus declared, that all this seeming zeal for Moses was the sheerest hypocrisy or self-deception. He charged the Scribes, Pharisees, and priests, with exalting Moses thus, only for their own interest. They sought to turn the popularity of Moses, as the great prophet of Israel, to their own account, by mounting on it to popularity for themselves. They saddled their errors upon misinterpretations of the law and the prophets, that they might thus secure the greater currency for those errors.

It was not Moses' doctrine which they really sought to maintain and propagate, but their own false and perverse traditions. And these traditions, for the most part, were utterly opposed to the Scriptures, as delivered by the inspired prophets, and subversive of the foundation of truth laid by them. For this it was that Jesus on one occasion (Matt. 15 : 3,) put to them the scathing question : " Why do ye transgress the commandment of God by your tradition ? " Under the appearance or pretense of extraordinary zeal for the law of God, they were guilty of a flagrant violation of that law. As their fathers had killed the true prophets of God under cover of devotion to His cause, so they were smothering the doctrine of Moses under the folds of their traditions. It was another illustration of *betraying with a kiss*.

How often has this treachery been repeated since then, in the history of the Christian church ? There is not an abomination in the entire creed or cultus of Popery, which has not in this way insinuated itself into the bosom of nominal Christianity. And evangelical Protestantism has more to fear to-day from this same deceit, than from any other single danger.

When prominent men and ministers arise in a church with their heads turned by vain speculations, and their hearts captivated by silly conceits, do they, usually, come out in open assault upon the established faith and worship of the church ? Far from it. On the contrary is not from very love for the church they seek to elevate her philosophy and improve her life ?

Suppose her sacramental doctrine does not suit them, or her faith regarding the ground and foundation of salvation. Do they frankly declare that they can no longer subscribe to the faith of

the church on those points, and honestly confess that they have adopted some other and radically different theory on the subject? By no means. Such a declaration or confession might lead to unpleasant consequences and defeat cherished schemes.

Another method is, therefore, adopted. Their new creed is declared to be the only true and profoundly philosophical exponent of the old faith. It is held forth and advocated as the very means of promoting the old faith, and building up the church. And this is assigned as the great reason in its favor. From very love to the faith, that faith is undermined and subverted, a new and contrary creed is erected upon its ruins, and all to save the old faith from being destroyed!

It is the old treachery of "betraying with a kiss."

By such treachery was primitive, pure Apostolic Christianity betrayed into the degradation of the secularized church of the empire under Constantine.

By a series of such treacheries were the truths and spiritual usages which, in part, survived that degradation gradually betrayed, one by one, until all were lost, so far as any formal visible organization was concerned, in the apostolic churches of Constantinople and Rome.

The spirit of this treason was the ruling demon of the persecutions of the Albigenes, the Waldenses, the Bohemian brethren, and the Huguenots.

By the same treachery the Episcopal Church of England and America has been betrayed almost back into the slough from which it emerged in the sixteenth century.

And facts which speak louder than words, may testify whether other churches, especially our own, are not in peril to-day of falling victims to similar evils.

Now let as many as has time, turn to Matthew 24: 3-28, and read each verse and word with devout care. And, having done this, let each ask, am I guilty, directly or indirectly, of ecclesiastical treachery, or am I giving countenance and aid to such treachery, by allowing myself to be duped by deceptive pretences, or bribed by flattery or self-interest?

---

Use what talent you possess. The woods would be very silent if no birds sang there but those who sang best.



THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM IN ITS HISTORICAL  
SENSE.

THE Heidelberg Catechism, composed by Ursinus and Olevianus in 1563, is the doctrinal standard of the Reformed church. More than three hundred years have passed since it was written by these distinguished men, and approved by the church as a true exponent of the teachings of the Bible. No change has been made in it during all this time, nor any dissatisfaction expressed with it by the distinguished theologians of the church. Many Commentaries have been written upon it, all of which have fallen in with the doctrinal system which it contains. This is an argument of no small weight respecting its merit. As soon as it was published it was cordially received by the Reformed church in the different countries where it had been established. When our fathers came to this new continent and settled in the wilds of America, they brought the Heidelberg Catechism with them as they did their Bible and hymn book, and had their children to study its precious truths as their only comfort in life and death. With such a history, it is no wonder that the church sets a high value upon the Catechism, and is not willing that it should be lightly spoken of, or that any of the doctrines it contains should be assailed, unless it can be clearly shown that they are not in accordance with the teachings of the Word of God.

But how, some ask, are we to know what it teaches? Are the views of Ursinus, as set forth in his Commentary, to be regarded as expressing its true sense? or are we to take later Commentaries as giving a more correct view of its meaning? We have heard so much of late years about repristination, that some have almost been led to believe that no confession, liturgy, or hymn book could be of any value for more than a few years. And yet in the face of all this talk, the Catechism is as warmly cherished to-day by the great body of our people as it has ever been. And if any one would propose striking out any question for the purpose of substituting something else in its place, there would be many voices against such an attempt, just as there were a few years ago when certain persons had their sensibilities shocked by its severe language, declaring the Romish Mass to be at bottom *an accursed idolatry*. Whilst the Catechism in its spirit is mild and peaceful,

like the Gospel itself, it has no sympathy with error or sin, and is ready to call it by its proper name.

But why should there be so much difficulty in finding out the true meaning of the Catechism. If persons come to it with the right spirit, and are willing to interpret it in accordance with its evident meaning, there will be but little difficulty. It is only when men want to *put something into it* which does not fall in with its doctrinal system, that they have to resort to forced rules of interpretations, just as has often been the case with the Bible itself. Of this we have had very forcible illustrations in the case of some of our eastern brethren of the Mercersburg-Lancaster school. Take, for instance, the attempt that was made a short time ago to show that the incarnation and not the death of Christ is the great central truth of Christianity, if not of the Catechism. This was a favorite theory with the writer. He thought he and his friends had seen what no one else had seen before so clearly. They were, therefore, in the van of Protestantism, and the discovery must be heralded to the world. But there was a serious trouble in the wording of the Catechism, whose teachings he had professed to receive, in that it declared in more than one place, that both the word and sacraments point to *the death of Christ as the only ground of salvation*. This, if interpreted according to what it at least seems to mean, gives special prominence to the sufferings and death of Christ, more so than to His assumption of humanity. How is the contradiction to be removed? The ingenuity of some men is a source of many inventions. Deep study penetrates into its hidden meaning. The contradiction is not real, it is only apparent. When the Catechism speaks, as it does, it is not giving us the central fact of Christianity, but only hitting a gentle blow at the Roman Catholic church. Its language is antithetical, and so gives prominence to the death of Christ only in our anti-Papal sense. And that this is, yea, must be so, we are told that it is the only interpretation that will accord with his notion of the *central idea of the creed*. Here we have another instance of the ingenious expedients to which men resort to be consistent with themselves.

The same is true of the strained interpretations that have been put upon what the Catechism teaches about baptism. This, again, we think, is very plain. The Holy Ghost, it tells us, works faith in the heart by the preaching of the Gospel, and *confirms* it by



the use of the Sacraments. And children are to be baptized, because they are equally with their parents members of the covenant and church of God. But this again is contrary to the favorite theory of these same persons, who teach that baptism *makes us* members of the church, and that the Christian *life begins with*, and in baptism, and that all that is afterward needed, is to develop the germ that is then and there planted in the soil of the heart. To maintain this baptismal regeneration theory, the greatest violence is done to the language of the Catechism. The covenant and church of God, we are told, do not mean what we ordinarily understand them to mean, but are to be taken in a broader sense, as meaning *the general congregation*, of which infidels and deists are in like manner members. Then we have long dissertations about *Taufgrade*, as if every one who does not hold to their notions, denies all virtue and grace in the Sacrament, and make it a mere unmeaning ceremony. What would Ursinus and the fathers of the Reformation think of such logic and sophistry, if they could again appear amongst us?

How, then, we may ask, are we to understand the Catechism? And is there any hope of discovering its real meaning? Or, must we be forever in doubt or uncertainty? We answer, that the Catechism, like the Bible, is a plain book, easy to be understood, if we only endeavor to find out its meaning in the right way. To do this, we must come to its study with a docile spirit, and let it speak for itself. The men who wrote it knew whereof they were affirming, and had perhaps as great ability to say what they meant as our modern thinkers. We should, therefore, give the language of the Catechism a natural and simple interpretation, and make it say what it was intended to express. And if any doubt still remains as to its meaning, we should then inquire, how did those who lived at the time in which it was written, and knew the views of its authors, and have been regarded as the best exponents of it, understand it? By pursuing a course like this, we will hardly be at a loss to know what is the historical meaning of our confession of faith. If this course had been pursued, we would not have the trouble we have had as a church. Those who are not satisfied with the old faith of the church should not attempt to change it to something else. This involves a gross wrong. If they can no longer subscribe to the doctrines of the church of which they are members, they should quietly go where they properly belong.

We have more respect for Wolff, Wagner, Giesy, and others, in going to the Roman Catholic and Episcopal churches, than if they had stayed in the Reformed church after they had repudiated her faith. And if there are those now with us who can no longer subscribe to the doctrines and mode of worship which our fathers practiced, would do likewise, we would soon have peace and a bright future.

This does not mean that we are to adhere slavishly to the modes and forms of thought of former times, and that there can be no clearer apprehension of the truth as it is in Jesus. No one has ever thought of such a thing. It requires only a little study and observation to see that there has been a great advance in theology. All that we plead for is, that this advance be in the right direction, and that it do no violence or wrong to the system to which it professes to belong.

G. W. W.

---

## Ursinus College Repertory.

---

### OUR LOCATION.

AMONG the arguments used to dissuade young men from coming to Ursinus College, or to draw away such as are connected with the Institution, that urged upon the ground of its *retired or secluded location*, is most frequently pressed. It is urged, that in consequence of this social retirement, students lose many of the advantages offered by larger towns, and especially they are, it is said, deprived of the means of pleasure and enjoyment afforded by such towns or cities.

This plea has a plausible sound. Those who look at such matters superficially, and do not take time to consider the force or weakness of an argument, may be caught by it. Especially may young men not acquainted with facts furnished by the history of the leading educational institutions of our country, be deceived



and misled by such an objection against colleges located in quiet and retired villages, and by such a plea in favor of those located in a city or larger town. The allurements of a city may present strong attractions and overpower far weightier considerations.

But is the objection valid, and is the plea in favor of cities as most desirable locations for colleges, a sound and good one?

Answers to this double question are furnished *first* by the history of American colleges and educational institutions, and, *secondly*, by a thoughtful consideration of the matter upon its own merits.

*First*, the history of our principal literary institutions bears overwhelming testimony in favor of comparatively retired locations. All the most prominent and successful colleges of our country were located in small villages, and gained their reputation in such localities.

When *Nassau Hall* (Princeton) was founded, Princeton was scarcely a village; and even after the college had been in operation about *fifty* years, the place had but eighty houses, 300 inhabitants, and one church. At that time the college numbered about eighty students.

*Yale College* was removed to New Haven in 1716. At that time New Haven was a small town, which took nearly a hundred years to gain some 3,500 inhabitants, notwithstanding its advantageous situation for commercial purposes.

*Schenectady* was selected as the seat of *Union College* when it was but a diminutive country town, and proved a very genial home for the institution. Small as the place was, it was preferred to Troy, Albany, or other cities in that section of New York.

At the time *Williams College* was established in Williamstown, Mass., the place was a village of about twenty houses, and yet was thought the very location for the purpose.

One of the most flourishing and influential colleges of Pennsylvania, *Jefferson*, was located in *Canonsburg*, a small out-of-the-way place, with few houses and inhabitants.

This list might be indefinitely extended, as any one can see by referring to the college statistics of the United States. Only a few instances are needed to refute the objection under notice. Those given above serve our purpose exactly. They prove that the most useful and influential colleges of our country, have done their great work in comparatively secluded localities. We do not

mean by this, places shut out entirely from free and easy communication with the world, but such as are not exposed to the turmoil, temptations and distractions of crowded cities or towns, with their grogeries, lager-beer saloons, mountebank shows, operatic performers, and humbug lectures upon all sorts of fancy subjects.

The arguments supplied by these facts, is strengthened by the contrasted comparative *failure* of institutions founded in larger towns and cities. In illustration of this, we simply refer to the University of New York, in the city of New York; the University of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia; Dickinson College, in Carlisle; the old Franklin College, in Lancaster, &c., &c. Even large endowments, (very large for the time,) and munificent State aid, could not secure success for them. They could get everything but what a college most needs—*students*.

It may, perhaps, be said, the institutions cited were founded long ago; the times have changed, and now a different policy must be adopted.

Here again facts come in to refute the argument. By far the largest, fullest, educational institutions of Pennsylvania to-day, are located in villages. One with 800 students on its last list is almost in the country, within five miles of a city of 20,000 inhabitants, and an old college of less than 100 students. A college on the eastern boundary of the State may be cited as an exception to this fact. That exception, however, is still an experiment. By common consent, therefore, small and comparatively retired places have always been regarded as the best localities for literary institutions. Some social and other disadvantage may have been attached to such locations. But they have been thought of small account in contrast with the greater advantages thus secured. This has been the judgment of the past, and it is fully confirmed by experience, and the best judgment of the present day.

In the second place, the question may be considered on its own merits, and in this view many reasons can be given showing that retired localities really possess superior advantages for educational institutions.

Rightly to appreciate these reasons, it is necessary of course to bear in mind what is the true aim and purposes of such institutions, viz.: to qualify pupils or students, whether male or female, by proper moral and scholastic training, for an intelligent and



worthy prosecution of the duties of life. This requires earnest faithful teaching on the part of instructors, and a diligent, serious improvement of the opportunities enjoyed on the part of pupils. A specific work is to be done, requiring zealous attention and a close, docile application. Whatever else is allowed in the way of needful rest from studies, or physical recreation and social diversion, must be a secondary matter, and subordinate to the great purpose for which such schools are formed and maintained.

Allowing this view to be correct, it will be easy to show that comparatively retired towns and villages possess great advantages over smaller ones, as locations for colleges.

1. Such retired localities are more favorable to the pursuit of Academic studies. There is less in them to divert and distract the mind. This is precisely what the student, at this period of his education, most needs. That he may rightly cultivate his faculties, and lay in a good store of sound knowledge, to qualify himself for his future course in life, is the great work of his collegiate career. To do this requires concentrated, undivided application to study. And the less there is to draw him off from this the better. The youthful mind and heart are only too apt to be captivated by carnal and worldly attractions, so that it is often found difficult to bring the thought down to earnest study.

There is a quietness in such more rural literary retreats which of itself exerts a soothing influence favorable to meditation. It is far easier to bring the mind to its proper work, and to keep it there.

Not that such retired localities are dull and lacking inspiration and incitement. The very opposite of this is true, and might be supposed to be true of places which bring the mind into more immediate contact with nature and its inspiring works. For healthy excitement of the mind, the country has immeasurable advantages over large towns and cities with their compactly built squares, and dusty, noisy, crowded streets.

2. Such localities, furthermore, are generally distinguished by a higher and purer moral tone in society. The advantage of this as an influence of great power on students will be readily admitted. Opportunity makes the thief. And opportunity leads many into other vices. It makes drunkards and debauchees. It makes dandies and fops. So that many a father and mother who have been induced to give their son a collegiate education, and for that

purpose allowed him to go to some institution in a city, have deplored the day. Their son returned, not a scholar, but a sot, not a young man of really valuable acquisitions in learning, but a conceited fop. Colleges in more retired places are less liable to lead to such unhappy results.

Consequently, also, it is more easy to maintain proper moral discipline in such institutions: With diminished temptations, there are of course fewer violations of that good order and proper behavior which it is always desirable to maintain. This not only adds to the comfort of the institution in general, but to that of every individual student.

Altogether we are persuaded that young men who have any right views of their own best interests and responsibilities will acknowledge, that for all the true purposes of education, not large towns, but pleasant, more retired places, are to be greatly preferred. Those who look upon a student's life at college as the time and season for sport, for frolic, for having a loose foot and a free hand, for learning the bad arts and habits of a demoralized society, will of course not assent to our view of the case. But such young men had better stay on their father's farms and occupy their youthful days at home with earnest manual labor, that go to college only to become idlers, and acquire immoral habits which will cling to their life like a cancer for the rest of their days.

In regard to the location of Ursinus College, we may add, that whilst it is so far a retired place as to be separated from the confusing bustle and distractions of a city, it is by no means so secluded as to be shut out from sufficiently easy and pleasant intercourse with the world. A ride of one and a half hour by rail brings us to the second largest city of the country, and at a trifling cost. And an occasional visit to such a city will be found more really gratifying than residence there. Besides, the vicinity around the college is thickly settled; there is a large amount of pleasant activity; we have churches and all the conveniences of life within easy reach, and can command concerts and lectures as often as we wish them. The topographical surroundings of the college leave nothing to be desired. And friends who have visited the place have not only been pleased with the location, but with one consent pronounced it in every respect most suitable and attractive.



HISTORY PHILOSOPHICALLY VIEWED.

GRADUATING ORATION.

[Below we publish the *Philosophical Oration* delivered by Mr. *Neff*, of Kutztown, one of our graduates at the last commencement. It was received by the audience with warm expression of applause, and will be found a production of considerable merit. By an oversight, the *Salutatory Oration*, published in the August number, appeared without the author's name. It was from the pen of Mr. *Moses Peters*, *Saegersville*, Lehigh county, Pa.]

"All the world's a stage,  
And all the men and women merely players;  
They have their exits and their entrances."

Comedies end in marriage. Tragedies terminate in the death of the hero. But to perceive the tenor and consummation of the world's mighty drama, requires the strongest universalizing power, and the deepest intellectual penetration. We meet with inscrutable mysteries in the analyzation of the individual mind. How much more difficult must it be to form any sort of clear conception of the world's soul, and its oceanic flow along the ages.

The lowest form of activity we meet in inorganic nature. The winds ceaselessly sweep seas and continents. The rivers stream over the surface of the earth and pour their contents into the bosom of the seas. The atmosphere receives the water of the ocean, and carries it back in the form of moving clouds, to water the dry land. The chemical laws which pervade all nature presents some of the most wonderful and admirable phenomena in the whole range of inorganic nature. This may be considered the lowest stratum of life. At any rate, it has the appearance of life. It is not the cause, but the condition, of all higher life. We go a step higher and we enter the sphere of vegetable life. Here we perceive all activity proceeding from centres, from germs which develop into individuals from within outward. Whereas, in more inorganic nature there is no such centralization of power, but all is diffused universally and uniformly throughout nature. We take a second step and we enter the domain of animal life, where we find superadded the power of locomotion, and instinct or animal intelligence. And lastly, we come to man, in whom we perceive epitomized all lower forms of being. Moreover, he is endowed

with the power of reason, which entitles him "lord of creation," and imbued with an immortal soul which binds him to God. To mark out the intellectual and moral progress of man, through the interaction of individuals, and the intersphering of nations, is the domain of history. Man alone is capacitated for such unending progression. There is far more in him than has ever yet come out; perhaps more than ever will come out. There is within him the germ of immensity, because created in the image of that mind which fills it. All lower forms of being are fixed or stationary, and therefore without history.

To form a correct conception of history, we must view it in its entirety. The rose of the garden, with its grateful odor and delightful color, is nothing more than one of the beautiful thoughts of God put in form, or objectified. All physical nature is a materializing or externalizing of the thoughts of God. Thought, therefore, is the source of finite or created being. Man is a creation. *History is the externalization of a divine purpose.* This proposition you will observe episodically, excludes materialism and everything pantheistic, from its grosser to its most subtle and delusive form. If man is God, or, if the substance of the Godhead is in man, it were just as pertinent to ask the question, What is the design of the being of God? as to ask what's the meaning of history? This divine purpose is the soul of the world's life. The peoples, republics, kingdoms and empires of the earth, are the material atoms which render visible to man's sensuous reason this underlying purpose, which molds and controls the destinies of nations, and unitizes all the infinitely varied phenomena of history. Here, then, we reach the idea of unity and its concomitant harmony, in the midst of this overwhelming diversity of historic phenomena. The infinite number of glittering orbs scattered through unlimited space, are all governed and controlled by one law—the law of gravitation. The events of history are points not more isolated than the stars above us. There is a sort of historic gravitation which controls and centralizes all the events of history, from the beginning to the very end of time. It is a law of physics, that not a particle of matter, or the least force, is ever lost. There is not a modicum of effort, whether individual or national, that is ever lost, and that does not leave a lasting impression, either for good or evil, upon the life of the world. The deeds of Alexander and of Napoleon, with their accompanying



influences, are no more isolated from the world's life than the island is isolated from the earth of which it forms a part, or, than spring from winter, or than my arm is isolated from my body. Here, then, we reach the true domain of the philosophical historian. There is no system of zoology, or chemistry, or astronomy in nature; but the animal kingdom, the chemical elements and the heavenly bodies, are the materials which nature furnishes, out of which the scientist constructs his system of science. So history furnishes the materials which the philosopher views in their casual relations, and thus constructs the science or philosophy of history. To him the nations of the earth are great historic luminaries, revolving in wonderful harmony and grandeur.

This divine purpose, moreover, of which history is the visible manifestation, is fixed and immutable. The wheel of a carriage revolves, but there is a central point which remains fixed and changeless; that is the axle. God's final cause in the creation of the world, is the axle, around which the great wheel of humanity revolves. One generation takes the place of another. One nationality supplants another. But in the midst of this external change and variation, the underlying scheme remains permanent and steadfast. Man's physical organism changes every seven years, but the organizing or form-giving power remains the same. Herein lies the identity of history.

One of the most striking characteristics of the human race, is its gradual and irresistible progression. All the improvements in the arts and sciences are but so many landmarks of the reaches and presence of thought. They are but the visible and tangible expressions of the ever onward flow of mind. There are two elements—permanency and progression, combined in every individual nation. Amongst the Greeks the element of progression held the ascendancy; but it lacked stability, and in a short time fell. Amongst the Chinese the principal of progression is almost entirely lost, and China is regarded as the symbol of permanency amongst the nations of the earth. The civilization of China is almost the same to-day as it was two thousand years ago. Now, although individual nations may stagnate, gradual and unending progression will never cease to be a characteristic of the race. There is something overwhelmingly sublime in the thought of the congregated bulk of humanity forcing its way through the mountains of destiny, and marching toward eternity with a steady tread.

Although the human race may at times seem to pause, it is only like the damming of the Mississippi, to accumulate new and irresistible force. Nature seems to enter a state of dormancy during winter; but beneath earth's covering of ice and snow there is an accumulation of vegetable energy which manifests itself all the more suddenly and admirably in spring. Though mankind may at times be overtaken by historic winters, they serve only as coverings for the silent accumulation of intellectual and moral force, which will sooner or later manifest itself in most exquisite forms and splendor. It were easier for man to stop the currents of the deep, to govern and resist all the force in nature, than to stop the current of the world's thinking soul. We can never contemplate the forces in nature without a sense of overwhelming sublimity. Yet the resistless might of the ocean's billows—the terrific power of steam—the almost omnipotence of volcanos and lightning, fall below the power of mind, though it be of a different kind.

Asia is the geographical and moral centre of the race. It is the continent of germs. There man was created upright and just. There the joyful news of a reconciling Mediator was first announced after man's apostasy. Moreover, Asia, on account of its gigantic or massive proportion, is admirably fitted to give firm root and foundation to the great tree of humanity, which has now overshadowed the whole earth in the colonization of the New World. And here upon the Western Continent, the sap which has circulated within its trunk for thousands of years, may yet be destined to be developed into the choicest fruits. But here we enter the domain of the future, which it is not our lot certainly to know. We read the history of the world from the creation of man up to the 25th of June, 1874. We turn another leaf, and it is blank—the scene is not yet acted; and the iron leaves of destiny we are not permitted to read. But the question may naturally arise, Why has the Western World lain barren up to within two hundred years ago? Providence moves in time like the gods of Homer in space—"it takes a step, and ages have rolled away."

Every department of knowledge has its leading fact or facts. All others are of subordinate weight or importance. Christ is the pivotal point, or basal fact in the history of the world. He is the picture. All history is a sort of background, serving to set off the image; however magnificent the framework and background may be, it is at once rendered imperfect, nay, meaningless. Without



the incarnation, without Christ's holy and miraculous life upon earth, without His death upon the cross for the sins of the world, the human race, as fallen, would appear nothing more than a mob rushing confusedly along the ages without method or aim. Here is the manifestation of wisdom which it is the supreme destiny of man to know. History is the soil prepared of God for the reception of this heavenly and incomprehensible truth. I am again ready to assert with the immortal poet, "All the world's a stage," and not an end in itself. It is a means and not a goal; without Christ the history of our apostate world would be a sealed book which no one were able to open.

History speaks only of storms, of devastation, carnage and war. Although these are merely agitations of the surface of humanity—some sort of historic eruptions or tornadoes—nevertheless they are clear indications of the deep-seated principle of sin and misery in the life-stream of the world. The parents of the race were created upright and perfectly happy. But when Eve reached forth her hand and ate of the forbidden fruit, all nature groaned and sighed through all her works, that all was lost. Then were the infernal gates opened, and sin and iniquity, with their accompanying train, overflowed the whole earth, and are now forming an inseparable element in the life-stream of the globe. The sweet and joyful songs of the little birds that sing around our doors, appear to us still faint reverberations of that paradisiacal bliss which we forfeited and lost through the fall. Their plaintive and melancholy strains in the midst of the scourging cold of winter, sound but so many intensely painful longings for their emancipation.

What now is the drift or tenor of the scene as thus briefly depicted? Viewed from a civil or human standpoint, it is the multiplication of artificial wants, and the means and refinements of physical and intellectual enjoyment. Viewed from a moral or religious standpoint, it is the restoration of the lost ideal image of God. These two assertions are demonstrable by a review of the history of the world. The glory of God is the resultant of the two. This we can see clearly only by the light of revelation.

J. G. NEFF.

## SPECIAL ITEMS.

*The adjunct Professorship of Mathematics.*—Prof. P. Williard having found it impracticable to get released from his present engagement, declined the call to the adjunct chair of Mathematics. It affords us pleasure to announce, however, that the efforts immediately made to provide for this emergency, have been most satisfactorily successful. The Rev. *Alvin S. Zerbe*, A.M., Associate Editor of the *Christian World*, has been secured for the position, and will enter upon its duties soon after the opening of the Fall Term. Mr. Zerbe holds the highest testimonials of scholarship in the various branches of a college course, and attained the first grade in mathematics. With the united talent and services of the Rev. Dr. Super (who will now be able to devote the desired attention to some theological branch) and Mr. Zerbe, the mathematical department of the college will be amply provided for. During his brief editorial connection with the *Christian World*, Mr. Zerbe has displayed special talent for journalism also. His contributions to that paper have always been read with interest, and have gained already quite a reputation for him, as a writer of very good English, as a dealer in very vigorous logic, and as a controversialist whose pungency has more than once probed to the quick sophistry of our logical friend at L., and rather unpleasantly titillated the editorial nerve of the senior editor of what used to be the *Reformed Church Messenger*. Wishing Mr. Zerbe a safe journey to his new home in the east, we may pledge for him a cordial welcome on his arrival at Ursinus.

*The Fall Term* of the college will have opened (Aug. 31st) before this number reaches our friends. Present information and prospects promise cheering accessions. Any who may find it impossible for them to start in at the commencement of the session, may enter subsequently at any time. It is desirable, however, that all should come on as early as practicable.

*For other items* of interest, see *notes of vacation trips* in Editors' Desk. It will be found there, that the resolutions passed at the late commencement, meant what they expressed and promised—efficient work for the cause, and a set purpose to maintain the principles for the defence and furtherance of which the institution has been established.



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS—*For Educational aid in Ursinus College:*

Rev. F. F. Bahner, Milton congregation.....	\$75 00
Rev. J. Sechler, Hanover.....	25 00
Peter Dietz, York.....	10 00
Chas. Young, York.....	5 00
J. F. Warner, New Oxford .....	5 00
Wm. S. Hildebrand, East Berlin .....	5 00
Rev. Dr. Helffrich, Fogelsville.....	11 00
Rev. M. L. Fritsch, Berks Co.....	15 50
“ “ “ (paid to Mr. B.).....	15 00
Rev. Aaron H. Leiss, Bermudian, York Co.....	16 70
Rev. A. Wanner, York, Pa.....	24 63

*For Home Missions.*

Per Elder Fr. Wolff, from the Abbottstown cong'n.....	\$26 50
Rev. M. Rowland } St. Matthew's.....	12 45
East Vincent.....	10 40

## EDITORS' DESK.

BUSINESS NOTICES.—*As our friend, Mr. Pearsol, has not yet been able to make the necessary arrangements for assuming in full the financial care of the Reformed Church Monthly, subscribers will please remit their dues directly to us.*

*All in arrears are earnestly requested to forward the amount due at once. Let no further appeal be necessary. As we have now a POSTAL ORDER OFFICE, money in small sums can be most conveniently sent in that way. Address—*

*J. H. A. Bomberger,  
Collegeville P. O., Mont. county, Pa.*

ALL EXCHANGES will please send their papers to *this office*, not to Lancaster. “*Pen and Plow*,” and several others, have been going to the latter place, and hence have failed to receive a notice from us.

*Dr. Schneck's Book against Mercersburg Theology.*—All agents and others having settlement to make for the sale of the above work, are requested to remit to *Lyman S. Clarke, esq., Chambersburg, Pa.*, who is authorized by Mrs.

Schneck, the executrix, to receive and settle for all amounts due on the book. It is earnestly desired that immediate attention be given to this matter.—*Christian World, please copy.*

We are still prepared to *fill orders* for the book; at the rates heretofore announced, viz: Single copies, (postage prepaid,) \$1.25. Per dozen, (expressage to be paid by the party ordering,) \$12. Special terms are made with agents.

In this connection it may be as well to note and correct some statements circulated regarding this book and its author, which are as false as they are malicious.

First, it has been reported, and is still repeated in some neighborhoods, that Dr. Schneck regretted that he had written and published the book, and that he had said, shortly before his death, that if he had it to write again he would make important changes in it.

Both these statements are utterly and unqualifiedly false, and we are authorized to pronounce them so. Dr. S. never, at any time, or in any way known to those who have the best means of knowing, showed or expressed the least regret at having done what he did in this case. On the contrary, he more than once declared, in conversation and in his letters to friends, directly the opposite of this. His heart and conscience appear to have been relieved of a heavy burden when the book was written and published. He wrote and published it, because he felt that he owed it to the church he loved, to utter his warning against the perils to which she was exposed through the pernicious errors taught by the professors at Mercersburg and Lancaster, and to expose the extent of those errors. It is true he long hesitated to come out, because of personal regard for those who were teaching such errors, and because he hoped that they might see the wrong they were doing, and change their course. But finding that they persisted in their schemes, a sense of duty to the church constrained him to do what he did. He did the work kindly, but faithfully. Whilst engaged in preparing the book, he more than once spoke and wrote of the peace of mind he enjoyed, in the conviction that he was endeavoring to perform a plain and solemn duty. And after the book was published, he more than once avowed the satisfaction and comfort he experienced at the result. This can be abundantly proven.

Never once, or anywhere, did he say or write to any one, that he regretted having written or published the work, or any material part of it. And whoever started the assertion that he felt such regret, is guilty of starting an unqualified falsehood, and whoever repeats the statement is guilty of giving currency to the falsehood.

Even in that letter to Dr. Gerhart, of which such malicious use has been made, whilst frankly acknowledging the formal mistake in regard to the quotation marks, he told Dr. G. most explicitly, that the sentence complained of, set forth nothing but the truth in the case, and that if another edition should be published, this fact would be abundantly proven. This, indeed, is one of the reasons why Dr. G. published only a small part of the letter, and persists in doing Dr. Schneck the common justice of publishing the whole of that letter.



The *other* false statement involves the ridiculous nonsense so often peddled through the country, about the profound learning of the chief teachers of Mercersburg theology, and the incapacity of such a man as Dr. Schneck to understand their writings. This conceit was nearly cured a few years ago (1868) by Dr. Dorner's pungent criticisms. But, unhappily for the parties concerned, that notorious sackbut of pompous verbosity, *Theodore Tilton*, paid Lancaster a visit afterwards, and so inflated the bag-pipes again with his æolian praise, that we shall probably not hear the last of the self-glorifying pæan for some time to come. It is not every American college or theological Faculty that can get Theodore Tilton's commendation. And some of them would not go very far for it, or make much boast of it, if they could secure it.

Time was when such "puffing" of the great learning of the individuals concerned, deceived some people. But that day has passed. Men have discovered that as puddles are not lakes, so "great swelling" words and phrases are not proofs of true wisdom. And the better they have come to see the errors hidden under the *mistical* sentences of the new theology, the more fully have they become persuaded of its folly. For awhile it was not understood, chiefly because people were disposed to give its advocates credit for more intelligence and loyalty to the faith than they deserved. It was not thought possible that they could mean to teach what their language seemed to say. This delusion once dispelled, there was no difficulty in understanding them.

Dr. Schneck could, and did, comprehend the real import of the new theology. With his shrewd, practical, Christian mind, he discerned it already in 1851, and sounded the alarm, as in the Editorial republished in our July number. But he yielded to explanations and other influences, and then continued for a long time a comparatively retired and silent observer of events. No doubt he hoped the erring teachers would discover and renounce their mistakes. After waiting long in vain, he gave the matter earnest, thorough consideration, and published the result in his book. In that book he shows that he was master of the work he undertook. And the real objection of Lancaster to the book is, not that Dr. Schneck was incapable of grasping the errors of their theology, but that he grasped them and dragged them out of their hiding-places of vague, ambiguous, and deceptive terms and sophisms, that even plain people could see them and realize the mischief lurking in the new scheme.

Hence, this effort to kill the book; and hence, the diligent endeavors of certain persons to break its influence by calumnious denunciations of it.

But all will not avail. The church is waking up more and more to a sense of the situation, and no plausible, pitiful cries of peace, peace, will succeed so long as false doctrines and revolutionizing schemes are sheltered and pressed within *her* borders.

*Dr. J. W. Nevin's last Anathema.*—It is not *our* fault if the present unhappy controversy forced upon the Church by the Romanizing efforts of the new-order party, sometimes involves personalities, that is, allusions to individuals and their views and doings by *name*,\* in order to expose and refute calumnious ac-

\* Personalities, in the offensive sense of assailing *private* individual character, have never been allowed in our pages, excepting in one instance, when it occurred inadvertently, and for which a due apology was made.

cusations. Even for this purpose we should have preferred another method, had truth and justice permitted. But when the advocates of strange and false doctrines seek to shelter themselves, and aid their mischievous cause by personally aspersing those who feel constrained to expose and withstand the hurtful innovations, the wrong must either be endured in silence, or it must be repelled in a personal way. If the former can be done without serious injury to the party assailed, or to the cause he may represent, it is usually the better course. But if silence should be perverted into assent to the wrong, duty requires an outspoken defence of the cause assailed.

The July number of the *Mercersburg Review* contains an article by the Rev. John W. Nevin, D.D., (or rather by President J. Williamson Nevin, D.D.L.L.D., as the *Review* has of late styled him) in reply to some Episcopal writer admitted into the same number of that periodical. With the purpose and tenor of the article, and of the controversy in general, between President Nevin and his Episcopal friend, we have no present concern. But in a *foot-note* to the first page of his article, in which Dr. N. speaks in high praise of Dr. C. P. Krauth's recent assault, in the *Review*, upon some doctrines which he (Dr. K.) alleges are taught in Reformed Confessions of faith, Dr. Nevin uses the following language concerning Dr. Schneck's book against Mercersburg theology :

"DR. SCHNECK'S MISERABLE TRAVESTY OF MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY, GARBLED QUOTATIONS, AND ALL."

This is, we believe, the first and only notice ever taken in the *Mercersburg Review* of Dr. Schneck's book.

Brief as it is, it is full of concentrated bitterness and venom. As the only notice taken of the book by the party concerned, it is contemptuous and contemptible. In spirit it is most malignant, and proves not only how keenly the writer has felt Dr. Schneck's calm, earnest and honest exposure of errors and schemes, threatening the life, as they have sadly disturbed the peace of the Church, but the shameful words also betray the angry intolerance of the writer of all attempts to expose those errors, and arrest their progress. As in time past, so now again, what Dr. Nevin cannot meet with fair argument, he tries to strike down by foul blows.

In its aim or purpose, the assertion was evidently meant to have the effect of a crushing anathema, and to supply willing tongues with words of fierce condemnation against Dr. Schneck.

The import and substance of the words are a sweeping, denunciatory accusation, charging Dr. Schneck with having written and published a book against Nevinism, which is,

- (1) A *travesty* of Mercersburg Theology ;
- (2) Which abounds in *garbled quotations* ; and,
- (3) Which contains "*all*" sorts of other things equally infamous.

This is not an indictment. It is an anathema. An indictment implies that the party accused shall have a full and fair opportunity of defense, and in that defense of proving themselves innocent of the charges made against them. Dr. Nevin and his court do not believe in such a process. It is entirely too Protestant and liberal for them. In matters concerning their partisan interests, and



when they have the machinery of power in their hands, they prefer the method of the Papal Inquisition; that is, let the accusation be summarily followed by the desired sentence and execution. So in this case. The words amount to this:

I, J. Williamson Nevin, have read or not Dr. Schneck's book against my Mercersburg Theology. I denounce it as a *travesty* upon Mercersburg Theology. Further, I denounce the quotations it gives in pretended proof of its assertions, *garbled*. And finally, I denounce *all* else in the book as fit only to be spurned and burned. I take no trouble to prove my charges against the book. I have denounced, and my sentence must suffice.

Dr. Schneck is not here to defend himself or his book against the outrageous wrong perpetrated by the above calumny. But as one of scores ready to vindicate a name far better known and deservedly dearer to the Reformed Church than that of the author of the calumny, and quite as able to do it triumphantly, we pronounce Dr. Nevin's accusation as entirely wanting in truth, as it is sadly deficient in those traits which usually characterize the utterances of gentlemen and Christians. In language which Dr. Nevin may possibly remember we used toward him of another person in York, 1866, we assert that Dr. Schneck was his *peer*, proudly as he may disdain the comparison, and entitled to as respectful consideration and decorous treatment as Dr. Nevin conceives himself to merit. And as long as we have a tongue to speak or a pen to write with, Dr. Nevin shall not additionally abuse with impunity the position and influence which he attained as a foreigner in the Reformed Church; partly through his deceived friend, by maligning that friend over his grave, and by seeking to screen himself from the natural and just consequences of his own theological errors and ecclesiastical schemes, by putting a blot on that departed friend's reputation. If Dr. Schneck loved Gospel truth and his Church as one of the truest representatives, in its historical faith, of that truth, more than he loved Dr. Nevin, a noble Christian spirit would honor him for it, not seek to blast him by a Popish anathema, or by calumnious accusations.

And as to Dr. Nevin's charge itself, we not only pronounce it utterly unwarranted and false, but we defy him to sustain it; we challenge him to the proof, *item* by *item*. And we make the following offer, viz.: *that if the columns of the "Reformed Church Messenger" will admit the case fully and literally, on both sides, the same shall be done in the pages of the Monthly.*

Let Dr. N. accept this challenge if he dare. Or, if he shrink from it, under whatever excuse, we will take either of his friends, Drs. Gerhart or T. G. Apple, as his substitute, on the same conditions.

Until this is done Dr. N. may fairly be held responsible, not only for having made a mean assault upon the person and work of a departed brother, but for being conscious of inability to vindicate that assault, made in the corner of an otherwise miserable foot-note.

---

*By the way*, Dr. Gerhart still persists in the injustice of withholding the whole of Dr. Schneck's last letter to him. No doubt its publication would be a humiliating exposure of an attempted wrong. But if the profound theology of his school has not power to constrain a man to do right at any personal cost,

what is it worth? Surely, truth and common justice are of more account than private or partisan interests.

*Notes of Vacation Jaunts.*—As in previous years, the present summer vacation has been improved by devoting some weeks of it to visits among brethren and friends in the interest of the college. These trips involved, of course, some labor. But all the toil they cost was more than repaid by the fraternal welcome always extended, by the cordial cooperation of brethren in our work, and by ready and liberal responses made to appeals for aid.

Our first visit was to York and Adams counties. After making two or three short calls on the way, the town of York was reached about noon, July 8th. There it was our privilege to meet with several brethren residing in York, who cheered us by their assurances of growing interest in our institution, and by the zeal with which they adopted measures proposed for its advancement. Brother A. Wanner, at whose house as being nearest the railroad depot we first called, gave us a fraternal greeting, and helped us to find our more immediate objective point, "the house of the Rev. D. Ziegler." Our veteran brother, the Rev. Dr. Ziegler, now among the oldest of our Reformed ministers, retains his full intellectual vigor, and participated as warmly as ever in the subjects of conversation. He is still suffering with the lameness contracted many years ago, but with a will and zeal rising superior to this impediment, accompanied us to several of his members, among them brother William Reisinger, who almost anticipated one purpose of our call, by a liberal donation to the college. Even our sorely afflicted brother, Jacob Ziegler, though disabled by paralysis for active work, continues to cherish the warmest sympathy for the cause. We are glad to find him sustained by divine grace under his heavy trial, severe as that trial must be for one of his active temperament and former diligence in the discharge of pastoral duties in an extensive field of labor. May the Lord strengthen him in the patience of faith and hope, and give him to realize that, "They also serve who wait."

In accordance with arrangements made, the Rev. R. Rahauser took us to see a portion of his charge east of York, introducing us in the course of the drive to several members of his Kreuz Creek congregation. Among others we had the pleasure of spending an hour with Miss Rachel Bahn, well-known as the author of a volume of poems in English and Pennsylvania German. Although an invalid, confined to her bed for nearly twenty years, we found her very cheerful, happy in indulging her taste for literature, and seeking to make her life useful to others. Brother Rahauser is pleasantly and diligently at work in his charge, which had been faithfully served for many years by the Rev. Dr. Ziegler, and finds reason for great encouragement at the end of his first year's pastoral experience. Thanks to brother R. for this day's enjoyment.

On Friday, July 10th, Rev. J. S. Weisz kindly conveyed us to the home of Father Nathaniel Spangler, about nine miles west of York. It was our first personal acquaintance with this warm and liberal friend of Ursinus, and we were glad to find in him one who had learned to devise liberal things in the right school, and whose fervent prayers accompanied his gifts to the cause of



the Lord. The evening was passed in pleasant conversation on matters in which all felt the deepest concern pertaining to the welfare of Zion. Such men are real Hurs to a pastor, whose counsel and support are invaluable.

On Saturday morning Father Spangler took us in charge, and, in company with brother Weisz, the first call was made upon the two brothers Eppelman, and their sister. Here, too, were hearts warm with the love of Jesus and His cause, and zealous for the faith of the Gospel. As a first token of their special interest in our institution, they donated a handsome amount in cash, with an expression of regret that owing to peculiar circumstances at the time they could not do more. These good people all remember with pleasure the visit of Elder Henry Leonard a couple of years ago, and would be very glad to see him again. Brother Weisz was compelled by Sunday engagements to leave us at this point, whilst Father Spangler drove us on our way a little further west. About noon we reached the pleasant home of Mr. George Hollinger, near Abbotstown, and being confident of a hearty welcome, it was made a resting-place for a few hours. Beside the hospitable entertainment warmly extended by brother Hollinger and his wife, we were cheered before leaving by the donation of what our esteemed agent Leonard would call one of his largest fish. Thanking God and taking courage, we started once more on our way, and before dark reached the residence, in New Oxford, of the Rev. Aaron Spangler, a son of our worthy escort. We had met before, and our greetings were mutually cordial. On Sunday morning it was our privilege to preach German in Abbotstown, connected with brother Spangler's charge. A large and interesting congregation was assembled, and notwithstanding some embarrassment in a language in which we have but little opportunity of exercise, the service, it may be hoped, was profitable. In the afternoon an English service was held in the church in New Oxford. Here also a large audience had gathered, and we had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with a number of the members.

Monday, July 13th, was given to calls in and near the village, which proved gratifying and encouraging in every respect.

On Tuesday our plans were interrupted by a telegram, summoning us to the funeral of a young sister of the Trappe congregation. There was only time to pay a short visit to East Berlin, and get to York for the night train homeward. An hour was taken, however, at East Berlin, for brief calls on two brethren there, members of the congregation of Rev. A. H. Leisse, to whose charge East Berlin belongs.

Although the visit was thus cut short, it was throughout a delightful and cheering one. Everywhere the brethren were earnestly prosecuting their blessed work, and, although doubtless encountering such trials as are incidental to their calling, were mostly encouraged with evidences that their labors were not in vain in the Lord.

Having reached home safely, and attended to the sad duty awaiting us, we started on our *second* mission on Saturday, July 18. This time the course lay northeastward, a previous engagement calling us to Upper Mount Bedford, Northampton county, Pa. As Easton lay directly on our route, and we had

two hours between trains, the opportunity of seeing a few friends in that pleasant home of former years, was gladly seized, our chief regret being that we could not stay longer and see more of them.

At Belvidere (New Jersey) we were met by Elder Houck, who took us to Centreville (or Stone Church), where the Rev. W. S. C. Rodrock, the successor of Bro. I. S. Weisz as pastor of the charge, resides. Bro. Houck and his family gave us a warm Northampton county welcome, and made us feel quite at home during our stay. On the following Sunday, morning and evening, we had the privilege of preaching for Bro. Rodrock, and both times to very large congregations. In the morning especially, the church, which affords sittings for about 1,000 people, was crowded, and it was specially inspiring to see so large a proportion of *young men* and *women* in attendance. The pastor has certainly great reason to feel encouraged in a field which promises so rich an ingathering from labor bestowed upon it. The Sunday-school also appears to be in a very flourishing condition, and well supplied with earnest workers. Occupying that pulpit on that Sunday morning, how could we fail to remember that beloved father in Israel, the Rev. Dr. Hoffeditz, who had so often preached, and prayed, and labored there; or Bro. A. S. Young, his successor, both of whom have long since gone to their reward. Their memory is still lovingly cherished by many to whom they ministered; and they being dead, still speak.

On Monday and Tuesday Bro. Rodrock very kindly introduced us to the families of several of his members, and the time passed agreeably and profitably. What all was accomplished will in due time appear.

By a previous appointment we were required to be in Allentown on Wednesday morning. There, prompt as usual to his engagement, we met the Rev. R. S. Appel, of Hamburg, who became our guide to some friends in Centre Valley, not far from Hellertown. With these, Wednesday night and part of Thursday was spent. On Thursday Father Zell very kindly took his guests over to Zionsville, stopping for dinner at the hospitable board of our friend, John H. Laubach, and making one or two other calls on the way. At Zionsville our headquarters were at the house of the Rev. Eli Keller, who has recently become pastor of this charge, where he rejoices again in having an abode among hills like those among which he roamed in early youth, around his father's house in Plainfield, Northampton county.

We cannot do more than give the most hasty sketch of this part of our trip, pleasant as it would be to dwell upon some incidents of it. The next day after our arrival, Bro. Keller helped us on our way homeward. In Zionsville we were generously entertained for dinner by Elder Mechling and his family, and in the afternoon went to Pennsburg, where, after an hour's pleasant interview with the Rev. D. Weiser, D.D., and his son, the Rev. C. Z. Weiser, Bro. Keller saw us safely landed at the railroad station, and we bade each other farewell.

Some two weeks later, an engagement with the Rev. A. G. Dole, of Huntingdon, called us away on the third special mission of this vacation. The renovated church of Huntingdon was to be reopened, and our aid on the occasion was desired. The place was reached in due time, old friends were met



and fraternal greetings were exchanged. Sunday, Aug. 25, the day of the re-opening, proved unfavorable weather for the occasion; still the attendance, both morning and evening, was good, and the services proved interesting. By various repairs, painting and ornamentation, the church has been very handsomely improved. On Monday evening service was held in the McConnells-town church, five miles south of H. Here we again found a very large congregation assembled, even larger than that which was gathered there at a day's notice a week ago. It is surprising how many people can spring up from among the surrounding hills. The large number of young people present was cheering. Bro. Dole is laboring successfully in this field, and if there be some who seek to trouble him, he moves on, preaching the old Gospel, and not in vain.

On this trip also we received *substantial* tokens of active and liberal interest in Ursinus College, more definite reports of which, as well as of what our warm friends in Northampton and Lehigh counties are doing, will be published in due time.

Our veteran cotemporary of the *Reformed Church Messenger* has been very much annoyed lately, it grieves us to say, at his utter failure in a recent argument with the junior editor of *The Christian World*. It must have been mortifying, no doubt, to find himself so thoroughly beaten, and in so quiet, neat a manner, like him of Gath by David, by so young a man. But whenever giants undertake the cause of the Philistines, they must expect to be vanquished. Our veteran friend chides his youthful antagonist with *being young* and *having no beard*! What this has to do with the argument is hard to see, unless it was meant to turn off earnest logic with a silly laugh. It is far less a young man's fault that he is not older, than it is an old man's fault if he is not wiser and better than he is. And as to our young brother of the *World* having no beard, it seemed to us of small account so long as he proved that he had plenty of brains, and, as the *Messenger* must confess, of pretty good quality. A beard can be borrowed or bought; but *brains*, as the *Messenger* well knows, if a man has not got them, why he must just do without.

## BOOK NOTICES.

From the *American Tract Society*, Philadelphia. Branch 1408 Chestnut street.

"Apologetische Vorträge, über die Grundwahrheiten des Christenthums." By *Chr. Ernst Luthardt*, D.D., of Leipzig. 7th edition.

By the publication of this work, the American Tract Society has done as good a service to our German friends as has been rendered in English by the issue of Dr. Christlieb's work. The lectures are popular in the best sense of that

term; that is, they are designed for the people, and discuss the important subjects treated in a way suited to all thoughtful and measurably cultivated minds. Although not so full or specific in details as the English work of Dr. Christlieb, these lectures cover virtually the same ground, and are pervaded by the same thoroughly evangelical spirit. Both are up to the times, and admirably fitted to meet the wants of the day. Our German clerical brethren would find in Luthardt a valuable aid in their apologetic studies. Then it is very cheap, a 2mo. vol. of 420 pp., well-bound, for \$1.25, and 10 cents add. if sent by mail.

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

OUR BRANCH—*Changes in the Ministry.*—Rev. J. Stechow, from Arnheim, Ohio, to Beyerstown, Pike county, Ohio. Rev. P. Ruhl, from Kenton, Ohio, to Auburn, Ind. Rev. H. C. Heyser, from Ebenezer, N. Y., to Rochester, N. Y. Hamilton Place No. 60, Rev. W. H. Wittenweiler, from Ind. to Homeworth, Columbiana county, Ohio. Rev. P. J. Spangler, from Marshall county, to Lake, Stark county, Ohio. Rev. E. D. Miller, from Miamisburg, Ohio, to Shenandoah, Schuylkill county, Pa. Rev. H. Hanhart, from Covington, Ky., to Chambersburg, Pa. Rev. John Gantenbeim, address Portland, Oregon. Rev. H. Hilbish, from Mt. Olivet charge, to Brooster, Ohio. Rev. Samuel Z. Bean, from Wakeshma, Mich., to Fulton, Kalamazoo county, Mich. Rev. H. Bair, from Waterloo, Ind., to Millersburg, Elkhart county, Ind. Rev. John G. Ruhl, from Findlay, Hancock county, Ohio, to Kenton, Hadin county, Ohio. Rev. C. Boerchen, from New Albany, Ind., to Cleveland, Ohio. Rev. C. Cast, from Cumberland, Md., to Baltimore, Md.

GROWTH OF THE CHURCHES.—Brady's Bend, Pa., 11 persons were added. St. John's charge, Pa., 18. Tuscarawas, Ohio, 12. Denver, Col., 5. Stockton, Cal. 4. West Alexandria, Ohio, 8. Sidney, Ohio, 7. Galion, Ohio, in two years added 91. Carolina charge, Ohio, 44. Saegertown, Pa., 15. Crawford county, Ohio, 7. Emmitsburg, Md., 22 within the year. Delmont, Pa., 2.

CHURCH DEDICATIONS.—The *Zion Reformed Church*, in Thompson Springs, Seneca county, Ohio, will be dedicated to the service of God, Sunday, Sept. 6, 1874.—The new church at *Bunker Hill*, Williams county, Ohio, was dedicated Aug. 23.—*Marshallville* (Wayne county, Ohio) *Church* was dedicated on July 26.

CORNER-STONES LAID.—On the 28th of July the corner-stone of a new Reformed church was laid at Middletown, Marion county, Ohio.

*Corner-stone Laying at Trappe, Montgomery County.*—The corner-stone of the new church edifice which St. Luke's Reformed congregation at Trappe is



engaged in building, was laid with appropriate religious services on Saturday afternoon, July 25. It was an occasion of great solemnity and interest. Prior to the formal act, the congregation assembled for worship in the adjacent Masonic Hall, the use of which has been kindly granted until the new church is completed. The place was crowded, even to the filling of the vestibule and porch. Four clergymen, representing as many denominations in the vicinity, were present, and participated in the solemnities. Others from a distance had been invited, and were expected, but seem to have been prevented from attending.

The services in the Hall were opened with an invocation, and the singing of Psalm 118, third part, "Behold the sure foundation stone," etc., announced by the Rev. Mr. Feger, of the *Evangelische Gemeinschaft*. Selections of Scripture were then made by the pastor, after which the congregation was led in a fervent and very appropriate prayer by the Rev. Joseph H. Hendricks, of the Trinity Christian Church, Freeland. In the regretted absence of the brother who was expected to deliver the principal discourse, the sermon was preached by the pastor, J. H. A. Bomberger, on Ephesians 2:20. The congregation then proceeded to the new edifice, and the corner-stone was laid with the usual solemnities. The church is in the suppressed Gothic style of architecture, consisting of a main building 45 by 70 feet, to be surmounted with a cupola and belfry; and a transverse building 30 by 45 feet at the rear of the main building, but connected with it, for a lecture and Sunday-school room. Being already under roof, it is expected that the entire edifice will be completed by December 1st.

INSTALLATION.—*Rev. E. Herbruck*, of Canton, Ohio, was installed on Wednesday evening, June 25th. *Rev. S. B. Leiter, D.D.*, preached the installation sermon. *Rev. Judt* was installed at Olney, Ill., June 7th. *Rev. Dr. J. H. Kline* preached the discourse. *Rev. A. C. Geary* was installed by Mercersburg Classis, as pastor of the Martinsburg, Pa., charge.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

*The Shakers*.—About two miles south of Lebanon Springs, New York, says the *Presbyterian Banner*, lies the Shaker village of New Lebanon. The religion professed by these people is comparatively a new one. About the year 1758, Mr. Lee, of Manchester, England, came under strong religious convictions, and, being joined by six or eight brothers and sisters, under the guidance of a vision, left England for America, settling in this district of country. After

working separately for a living, and suffering persecution and hardships for many years, the little band gathered into a religious society in the woods at Watervliet, near Albany, in 1776, at the time of the breaking out of the Revolution, when the whole country was in a ferment. About 1779 a great religious excitement took place in this region. The leading spirits engaged in the movement were Joseph Meacham, a Baptist preacher, and Samuel Johnson, the first Presbyterian clergyman in that part of the country, known on Souther's old map as the "King's District," a part of which was called New Lebanon Woods in those early days. At this revival certain unusual and hitherto unknown phenomena took place. The devotees were moved to shaking, jumping, and talking in unknown tongues, or in gibberish. Many were thrown into trances, and some "had gifts"—that is, moved by a higher power to exhort and pray for their brethren. These were the first spiritual manifestations to the Shakers in this valley. The written history of the Shakers alleges that Joseph Meacham and several others, voluntarily made a pilgrimage to "Mother Lee," then the head of the Shaker Society at Watervliet, near Albany—the first Shaker gathering in America. After hearing her preach they at once adopted celibacy and became converts to the faith, returning at once to Lebanon to preach the new doctrines to their neighbors. There is little doubt that Joseph Meacham was the first Shaker convert in New Lebanon, and that Rev. Samuel Johnson also embraced the faith about the same time. The society at Mount Lebanon numbers probably less than three hundred. It is, however, almost impossible for a world's man to ascertain their exact numerical strength. It is a delicate subject with a Shaker, who studiously endeavors to conceal the gradual dying out of Shakerism as regards their decreased numbers. Even the rank and file of "Covenant members" know little about the number of believers in families outside of their own. It is the aim of the leaders to keep each family strictly isolated from all others. Every avenue of free communication with the outer-world is carefully guarded; every private or social letter written to absent friends must undergo their perusal and sharp scrutiny. The following is a sample of their by-laws: "Brethren and sisters shall not shake hands with each other under any circumstances, or pass each other on the stairs, or talk after going to bed, or to and from meals and church, or at the table. All books and publications, except the Bible and those originating among the Shakers, must not be perused on the Sabbath." Sisters must not walk out for exercise further than the limits of the door-yard, without the company of another female and the permission of the elders. They being considered as the weaker vessels, many such safeguards are generously thrown around them for their especial protection. A writer in the *New York Evening Post* says: "The Sabbath services of the society are tiresome and monotonous to a degree, even for the outside looker-on. The church is a very plain building, with an arched roof. There are two doors, just as there are in country school-houses. There is marching and singing, and dancing and clapping of hands, and monotonous gestures, and beating of time, which cannot be described. One is impressed at first with the ghastly corpse-like appearance of the company as they march solemnly back and forth. The Shaker costume resembles the grave-clothes



worn some thirty years ago. If their faces were less sad and careworn, one might fancy that the 'Resurrection Day,' which they sing of so much, had come; that the neighboring cemetery had given up its dead, and that they had assembled here to enter upon that happy state of existence in which 'they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels which are in heaven.' The order with which they perform their marching and filing denotes a great amount of drilling and practice. After the peculiar exercises, the leading members address the meeting, dwelling on the general truths and precepts of religion, or expounding their peculiar doctrines."

*Episcopal.*—The chapel of the Trinity Memorial church, Denver, Colorado, was lately opened for public service. This is the commencement of a worthy monument to the life and labors of the lamented Bishop Randall. It is designed to erect a large church, as soon as the love of the church will furnish the means to commemorate the labors of one of her most faithful servants. The chapel is a plain, brick structure, costing about twenty-five hundred dollars.—In the Diocese Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ohio, a resolution was offered making women over eighteen years of age eligible to office in the vestry of any church in the diocese of Ohio. Bishop Bedell spoke not directly in favor of this resolution, but in favor of the idea contained in it, that of making the service of women available in church affairs. Great difficulty is felt in initiating Episcopal services in new places on account of the scarcity of material for church officers, and hence, we suppose, this proposition, which may possibly come before the October General Convention for some action.—There is a speck of war in the Episcopal camp at Baltimore. The recent convention refused to recognize a new church at Washington, on account of its Ritualism. This victory of the Low Church party encouraged Rev. J. E. Cathell, of the Church of the Ascension, to warn his people against attending St. Luke's, Mt. Calvary, or St. Paul's, in Washington, where "gross errors and heresies" were taught. He would as soon have his people attend Catholic service or a Sunday concert. To a polite note of Dr. J. S. B. Hodges, rector of St. Paul's, asking if the obnoxious words had really been uttered, and if not, would Mr. Cathell state precisely what he did say, Mr. Cathell replied smartly, that the doctor had enjoyed the privilege of hearing an uncommonly accurate report of the address in question. From this point the dispute has been conducted with considerable bitterness on both sides, and the correspondence just printed has caused a good deal of excitement among good churchmen.

*Reformed Episcopal.*—The following are the principal points of distinction between the Reformed Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal Churches:

1. The Protestant Episcopal Church does not recognize the ordination of, or invite to preach, the ministers of the Baptist, Congregational, Lutheran, Methodist and Presbyterian branches of the Church. The Reformed Episcopal Church recognizes and coöperates with these denominations of Christians.
2. The Protestant Episcopal Church asserts that a bishop belongs to a distinct order of ministers, separate from the Presbyters. The Reformed Episco-

pal Church believes, as did Archbishop Cranmer, the organizer of the Church of England, that a bishop is only a *Presbyter primus*.

3. The Protestant Episcopal Church calls its Presbyters priests. The Reformed Episcopal Church calls them ministers.

4. The Protestant Episcopal Church does not forbid the using of altars as communion tables. The Reformed Episcopal Church prohibits the erection of an altar as a communion table.

5. The Protestant Episcopal Church requires communicants of other Churches to be confirmed. The Reformed Episcopal Church receives exemplary Christians by letter from the pastor, or other proper authority of the Church to which they belonged.

*Protestant Episcopal.*—There are five Protestant Episcopal parishes in New York in which the confessional is used, and penance taught as one of the sacraments. The Protestant Episcopal Convention of Maryland has taken a stand against Ritualism, in refusing, by a vote of 119 to 52 to permit the organization of the Church of the Holy Communion. This Church is decidedly ritualistic. It is probable that the attempt to perfect its organization will yet be made; but in the Episcopal Communion, a church which sets up for itself, is considered guilty of heresy and schism.

*Roman Catholic.*—The German Catholic Congress at Mayence, last month adopted resolutions favoring the reestablishment of the independence of the Holy See, protesting against the constitution of the German Empire and its foreign policy, and calling for the "amelioration of the condition of the working classes by comprehensive legislation initiated by the German government."

*The Pope*, some time ago, excommunicated every member of the Order of Freemasonry from the Church, and ordered them to be denied its privileges. But he himself has many years been a member of the Order, and now in turn he has been tried and expelled from the Order by the Grand Lodge of Italy, and the decree of expulsion has been entered upon the records of the Order and published, signed by Victor Emanuel, Grand Master of the Order in Italy.

*A Roman Catholic paper*, says the *Methodist*, gives a suggestive comment on the boasted increase of its church in this country. It publishes a picture representing a youth holding a placard which bears the boast: "In 1791 there were in the United States but one bishop, twenty priests, and about twenty churches. The Catholic population numbered 100,000. To-day there are seven archbishops, fifty-nine bishops, about 5,000 priests and 6,000 churches, while the Catholic population numbers 10,000,000." Opposed to this are figures representing that 14,000,000 persons, who should by descent have been added to the Roman Catholic population, have been lost from it to Protestantism and Indifferentism. This is too large an estimate, but it is theirs, not ours. How does the growth of Protestantism compare with this showing? It may be illustrated by the statistics of Methodism. In 1791 there were 250 Methodist preachers and 76,153 members in the United States. Now there are about 12,000 preachers, 2,600,000 members, and ten to twelve millions of population. The other Protestant denominations will probably show a like relative increase. The Roman Catholic growth has resulted almost entirely from foreign immigration. Except as to the Reformed and Lutherans, the Protestant churches have gained but little from this source. Thus the facts show that the growth of Protestantism keeps pace with the growth of the country, while the Roman Catholics, by their own admission, are falling behind, and fail to keep even those accessions which immigration brings to them.

*A correspondent* of the *New York Evening Post* writes as follows from Larnica, Cyprus, under date of June 29:



Information has just been received to the effect, that the German Exploring Expedition, under the direction of Dr. Sepp, has been very successful in ancient Phœnicia. As the expedition is under the patronage of the Emperor of Germany, a great deal of pains has been taken to conceal the movements and discoveries from the public eye until the Government at home has been fully informed of the results. An entire shipload of antiquities has just been despatched to the port nearest Berlin, and after they have been duly stored in the Museum of Christian Antiquities there, they will be described and photographed. Notwithstanding the attempted preservation of profound secrecy in the matter, a few details have come to light, which I shall jot down here briefly. Dr. Sepp succeeded by great efforts in excavating the Christian Cathedral at Tyre. Here he found the undoubted tomb of Frederick Barbarossa, whose remains, it will be remembered, were long since carried to Spire, and deposited in the same coffin that holds the dust of his Queen in the cathedral. The doctor also found the tomb of the first Bishop of Tyre after the crusades, together with his robes of office, and several ornaments of silver and gold, all in the best state of preservation. Besides these, several paintings were discovered on the walls—one of the twelve apostles, many of the early Christians—to say nothing of sculptures in marble, bronze, and terra cotta, and interesting remains of the architecture of the early Christian era. Another of the remarkable discoveries of the Doctor, is the Pagan temple of Melkart (Baal). Some of the columns of the temple are double, and measure six feet in diameter and thirty-nine feet in length. Germany, however, has not monopolized archaeological efforts in this direction. Mr. Maudslay, an Englishman, in carrying out some improvements on the grounds of Bishop Gobat's Orphanage, on Mount Zion, found several ancient baths and cisterns, a mosaic pavement overlying the remains of an ancient temple, and, most remarkable of all, an ancient lime-kiln, which had been heated by means of olive seeds for fuel. He also unearthed a flight of thirty-nine steps, leading from the old wall of Zion down to an outside fort, the walls of which were twelve feet thick. The American exploring expedition is also making fair progress, although the details have not yet been received.

*Germany and the Ultramontanes.*—Again, in the body of the German nation the love of fatherland is so strong as to amount to a passion: and upon a square issue between church and country they will stand by their country. This is especially true of the more intelligent Catholics. A young lawyer of the Rhine provinces said to me: "I am a Catholic and hold to the faith of my church. I could not join the Old Catholics. But in this conflict between the government and the hierarchy, I must stand by the government; for I am a *German* before I am a Catholic." He added that this was a general feeling with Catholics on the Rhine, and that all the trouble came from the clergy. I have been assured lately from good sources, that in the Rhine provinces there is a very strong undercurrent in favor of "Old Catholicism," but that it is repressed by the still dominant power of the hierarchy.

But, above all, there is in the people of Germany a growing pride and satisfaction in their national unity; and, as it becomes evident that the Ultramontanes are seeking the disruption of the empire, this national feeling makes even good Catholics indifferent to the fate of rebellious bishops. Americans will get the key to the whole position if they will reflect that the Roman hierarchy now stand toward the German empire as the slave oligarchy used to stand toward the American Union. The position of the hierarchy is: Give us our way in everything, administer the government in our interest, let us do as we will, or we will break up the empire! In the province of Posen leading Catholic journals now advise that the church shall make common cause with the Poles, and stir up the antagonism of races as the means of breaking the power of Germany. Nothing could please the Ultramontanes better than a French invasion on one side, supported by a Polish insurrection on the other. Hence the determination of the government to restrain the *political* power of

the hierarchy; and hence, also, the acquiescence of patriots in the extreme measures of the Parliament.—*Correspondence of the Independent.*

*Honesty in Church Matters.*—The Rev. W. A. Starrett, son-in-law of the late Rev. John Ekin, D.D., formerly of Pittsburgh, Pa., has recently withdrawn from the Presbytery to which he belonged, and from the membership of the Presbyterian Church. He has taken this step not under any charges of immorality of conduct, or impropriety of life; but simply of his own accord, and only because he has ceased to hold the doctrines and principles of the Presbyterian Church. After a full consideration of the case, and earnest and prayerful interviews with him, the Presbytery acceded to his request, and dropped his name from its roll, and he is now no longer a member of the Presbytery or of the church. Referring to the case, the *Presbyterian Banner* uses the following language, and will have in it the decided approbation of all who love honesty—and honesty that ought most assuredly be as much in the church profession and connection as in any thing else:

Not a stain rests upon his moral or religious character, but he is unwilling to remain in the Presbyterian Church when his "Convictions of truth are no longer in accord with some of what are regarded as principal or fundamental doctrines in the Confession of Faith." How strikingly does this contrast with the miserable and false declaration of the *Independent*: "That a man may honestly remain in a Church whose Creed no longer fully represents his opinions? How much better to do as Mr. Starrett has done, than to attempt to break down the distinctive principles of his Church, and yet remain in it? How much more noble would it be for those barnacles in the Church who have not the courage to declare openly their disagreement with the Creed they profess, but who insinuate their real sentiments by senseless tirades against Creeds and Confessions, and who take special pains to make their people believe that there is no real agreement among those who profess to accept these forms of faith, to imitate the example set by Mr. Starrett?"

The *Christian Intelligencer* gives an interesting account of the imprisonment and release of Futagawa Ito, one the first Japanese converts to Christianity. He had been baptized in 1870, at Nagasaki. In the spring of 1872 he was arrested and confined in various prisons until August, 1873, when he was released, through the efforts of the United States Minister, Mr. De Long. He had suffered much and had once, driven to despair from his exposure night and day to mosquitoes, attempted to take his own life. For weeks, in journeying, he was chained by an iron collar on his neck to the two sides of his prison-box, in an upright position, never being allowed to lie down. Whenever brought forth for examination, it was with the collar on his neck and heavy chains fastened to either side of it. The power of working miracles was charged upon him, and he was repeatedly required to perform one. From his fellow-prisoners he received worse treatment than from the officers and jailers. These prisoners were of the anti-foreign party, and bitterly reviled him for his conversion to the foreign religion. Several of the most bitter of them were afterward beheaded. Though sometimes tempted to return to heathenism, his faith prevailed, and he was able to preach Christ in a number of prisons. Since his release he has made a good impression by his modesty, and simple, earnest addresses.

The *Christian Intelligencer* says: "We are happy to record the fact that a member of our denomination, whose name we are not at liberty to mention, has just given one thousand dollars to the cause of education, under the following circumstances: This gentleman had a son whom he intended to prepare for the ministry; but the son, after uniting with the Church, did not think himself so well fitted to become a preacher as a merchant. The father prudently allowed his son to follow his strong inclination; but determined that, if he could



not have his own boy in the clerical ranks, he would at least send a substitute. And so he has given the funds to support a student for three years in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick. Here is a noble example of the way in which many parents might discharge some part of the obligation which they sustain to the Church of Christ in regard to their children."

*Prof. Remscheubusch* gives the following account of the *Stundists of Russia*: "In Russia many sects have separated from the national church, claiming to be the true Orthodox Greek church; and in some of them there seems to be some real piety. But the Stundists differ from them all, as they have arisen by the contact of religiously disposed native Russians with pious Germans in southern Russia. Several hundred thousand Germans live in southern Russia, and a very large proportion have descended from the so-called 'Pietists,' or 'Stundists,' who emigrated from Wurtemberg to Russia about fifty or sixty years ago. 'Pietists' is a nickname given to earnest Christians all over Germany; Stundists, from the German word *Stunde*, hour, *i. e.*, hour of prayer or for prayer meeting. Many of these German Pietists of Russia have become Baptists, and a large proportion of the native Russians who inclined towards the views and practices of the Pietists, were on the point of becoming Baptists when the persecution broke out and prevented them from being baptized. This will account for the fact that the Baptists are called Stundists, which is a general term, embracing Baptists and Pedobaptists. It will also account for the fact stated, that some Stundists recently brought their children to the priests to be christened. Doubtless they never had been Baptists, but were simply people who attended prayer-meetings. I have positive information that the tendency of the Stundist movement among the native Russians is decidedly towards the Baptists."

*An Old Native Race.*—Recently mention was made of the discovery in Arizona of remains of ancient towns, apparently destroyed by fire, and evidently once occupied by a race of people much more advanced in civilization than Indians or Mexicans. A similar discovery has been made in New Mexico by Captain W. C. Manning, an officer in General Crook's command, during the campaign against the Apaches last year. He found not only the ruins of ancient cities, but a race of people which holds itself aloof from the Indian and Mexican races. One of the inhabited towns has dwellings for four thousand people, although the population has dwindled to 1800. In language, dress, customs and appearance, the people resemble the Chinese. They were visited over three hundred and forty years ago by a Jesuit priest, and there seems to have been no change in their habits, language, or dress since that time. The women are held in high respect, and their duties are confined to the household. The government is a conservative republic, and the morality of the people is irreproachable, so far as is known to foreigners.

Under the head of "Does it Pay," the *Christian Intelligencer* well says: "Many days of arduous practice at the oar, followed by other days and weeks of exhaustive 'training,' terminated last week in a race or two by the 'crews' of nine of our principal colleges, in each of which one crew was a winner and the rest losers. And all this preparation and struggle resulted in rewarding the successful crews with the renown of being 'victors;' and they will be entitled to wear the champion's belt, or feather, or fox's tail, or oar, or whatever else the prize may be, until they are beaten in a similar race by another crew, more hardy or skilful, or possessing greater physical force, endurance, or horsepower than they. Meanwhile, the young gentlemen composing these crews, and hundreds of their college companions, have given their whole time for an indefinite period to the preparatory work of the races, and have bent their thoughts upon the result as if it involved life or death. They have also con-

tracted habits and frames of mind, and indulged in aspirations which, while they may make successful scullers or rowers, will have the reverse of a beneficial influence upon them either as students and scholars, or as members of society. Besides, if we regard the experience of Oxford and Cambridge and other English institutions from which the 'regatta' has been copied by our colleges, the present development of skill and muscle resulting from the strife, has been purchased at the cost of permanent future physical, as well as moral and mental, injury to the immediate participants. And, finally, the races have been the golden opportunity of professional and amateur gamblers, of which they have availed with equal subtlety and industry to practice an insidious and most dangerous form of their infamous but too popular trade. The simple question that comes to our mind is, 'Does it pay?' Is the result attained worth the expenditure of time and strength required, or the strain upon health and morals which it involves? Is the victory, when gained, a thing to be highly prized, and what is it worth? In what does it differ from the victory gained by one prize-fighter, or by one horse over another? Is it a thing to be proud of, or does it, in any particular, contribute to the improvement of students in the subjects of their college course, or fit them to become wiser, more learned, or better than those who do not engage in them? These are questions that are worth pondering; and if they are pondered faithfully and conscientiously, the answer that must be given will be, that these young gentlemen are paying too great a price for the whistle."

*In Liberia* there are fifty-two ordained ministers, all colored men, except one, and six of the number are converts from gross heathenism. Ninety other persons are engaged in the work of the gospel.

*The Free Church of Scotland* is ahead with its noble sustentation scheme. This year about \$760,000 has been raised, an increase of about \$60,000 over last year. Each minister receives from it \$750 and a share in the surplus fund. The whole income of the Established Church last year was about \$2,500,000.

*The Catholic World* claims that there are at least three hundred and fifty thousand girls in schools presided over by nuns of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, and that at least sixty thousand of these are poor children educated free of expense.

*According* to Professor Freidrich, one of the leaders of the Old Catholic, preparations have already been made at Rome for the canonization of Pius IX. Accounts are published of miracles which he has performed, among them that of raising from the dead the Princess Odescalchia, by the mere blessing of the venerable old gentleman.

*Hitherto* Russia has been an unfavorable soil for Protestantism, the total number of Protestants in its population of eighty millions being less than three millions, mostly Lutherans. At the last census Mohammedans were more numerous in the Russian Empire than Protestants, and there were nearly a million more Roman Catholics than there were Protestants. The great bulk of the population, being more than five-sixths, belonged to the Established Russian or Greek Church.

*Spain.*—Madrid papers state that the Carlists have seized a number of men, women and children on the Cantabrian coast and in Biscay, numbering in all 1600 persons, and hold them as hostages, to be shot in case of an attack by the Republicans. Decrees have been issued, declaring all Spain in a state of siege, sequestrating the property of Carlists, whose estates will be sold, liable to heavy penalty, to the relatives of Republicans slain, and finally creating a special reserve of 125,000 men. The government announces in its official order that it will not permit the shooting of prisoners in retaliation for Carlist atrocities.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—OCTOBER, 1874.—No. 10.

---

FELLOWSHIP WITH THE FATHER.

Primitive Christians, as shown in our last article on their *faith*, had clear and definite views of God, as being, in His essential nature, infinitely exalted above all creatures, and distinct from them in His personal Godhead. With this fact they were satisfied to let their faith rest, so far as the *nature* of God, or of His essential being, was concerned.

No doubt they felt tempted at times to go further in their inquiries regarding this point. They had a reason naturally as proud and vainly curious as that of any Brahmin dreamer, or any Grecian philosopher, or any German pantheist or theosophist, or any English deist, or any feeble imitator of either of them in America or elsewhere.

It is a very common weakness of men when once they wake up at all to earnest thinking, and especially to thinking about God, to imagine themselves able to go down much deeper into the subject, or to ascend to loftier heights regarding it, than any who have lived before them, or may live after them. How gratifying to vanity, if they can bring themselves, and some admiring followers (as much deluded as themselves), to believe that they have made discoveries in this vast unfathomable ocean, more profound than were ever made before, and have surpassed in their researches all the efforts of the wisest men during the past five thousand years. With an estimate of their intellectual powers which allows of no limits, and an assumed ability "by searching to find out God," they not only venture boldly on the attempt, but return from the

attempt with self-complacent confidence of having succeeded in it.

Then they proclaim their imagined discoveries. They speak and write of God, as to His eternal, infinite, essential being, as a mathematician does about triangles and squares, about parabolas, and an asymptote, or as modern materialists do about physical nature. They claim ability to define God, not in the modest Gospel sense, but as other men try to define gravitation and electricity.\*

Primitive Christians indulged in no such daring speculations or presumptuous attempts to pry into the secrets of the infinite, essential nature of God. Like the Psalmist rather, "their hearts were not haughty, nor their eyes lofty; neither did they exercise themselves in great matters, or in things too high for them." They were content with meditating upon God in the pure light of His revelation of Himself, and found in that revelation, what all may find in it, enough to satisfy the highest lawful aspirations of every devout mind and heart, and more than enough for the most gifted human intellect fully to comprehend.

In this they showed their piety as well as their intelligence. And their meek unpretentious teachableness was rewarded. "Following on to know the Lord" in the path plainly marked out by God Himself as best suited to the limited power of human thought, they really attained, in their simplicity, to clearer and more sanctifying views of God, than any proud philosophers ever acquired. For it is a fact proven by ancient and modern ex-

---

\*Some of our readers may be interested in the following specimen of such attempt, as illustrating the extent of the presumption of a certain class of "would be" philosophic theologians. It is translated (as far as it is at all translatable) from the work of a recent disciple of the pantheistic Hegel.

"The pure idea (thought) of God contains, primarily, being as *thinking*, and this is the doctrine of the *essence* of God; then thinking as *being*, and this is the doctrine of the *existence* of God. Absolute pure thought is here taken in its distinction from itself. But this, as essentiality and reality, is resolved into unity, in which both are absorbed, and this is the doctrine of the divine *attribute*. Without such inter-action and mediation, the proposition A-A, or God-God, would be a tedious one."

And this is to be received as an exhaustive and philosophically satisfactory definition of that God who is, and has declared Himself to be, "unsearchable," and who, as the Infinite Jehovah, must be so for finite mind, as to His essential nature. How striking a demonstration of the Apostle's words: "Thinking themselves to be wise, they become fools."

The authors and disciples of Mercersburg theology have never ventured quite so far as to avow all their speculations on this subject. They seem to be prudently restrained from publishing a full statement of their views in a systematic form. But occasionally hints are thrown out, as feelers, perhaps, which pretty plainly indicate the direction of their philosophic, or theosophic sympathies, like that which declared man to be "an emanation from the substance of God," criticised by us some months ago.



perience, that philosophic speculations about God never promoted personal piety ; just as the most zealous advocates of churchliness and baptismal regeneration, and the real (substantial) presence, and ritualistic ceremonies in public worships, and sacerdotalism, and absolution, are often very indifferent Christians, according to the Gospel pattern.

God is, and has revealed Himself to men, not in order that human reason may have a vast and grand subject, upon the investigation of which that reason may have opportunity of exercising and displaying the keenness of its eye, the breadth and strength of its grasp, and its power of flight. And yet there are men of at least enough intelligence, education and piety to warrant the expectation of better things, who so far forget themselves and what they owe to "the high and holy one who inhabiteth eternity," that they discuss Him as they would any earthly topic which might excite their more serious curiosity. 1 Tim. 6: 20, 21 ; 2 Tim. 2: 16-18.

But whilst early Christians piously shunned all such profanity, their theology, so to call it, was full, minute and clear upon all that concerned *the close relation which God was pleased to establish and maintain between Himself and his believing children.*

1. They believed and held that God was their *Father* in and through Jesus Christ. And this they held not in the sense simply in which, as Creator, He is the Father of all men. They learned to know Him and believe in Him as their Father, in a sense far more intimate, vital and direct, a sense which placed them in a correspondingly near and living relation to Him as children.

Hence, when they addressed Him in their prayers as "Our Father," or as "Abba, Father," which they were encouraged to do, and mostly did, the term was not used or understood as only figurative, or as an endearing form of address, but as setting forth a real fact. They regarded God as their Father, *because* they received from Him that "grace which brought to them salvation" (Titus 2: 11) by Jesus Christ His Son, who Himself was God manifested in the flesh for their redemption by His atoning death. Furthermore, they believed in Him as their Father, *because* they were "begotten of Him" and "created (as Christians) by Him in Christ Jesus." That is, they knew, believed and held that they were indebted immediately and wholly to the grace and power of

God, wrought in and upon them by the Holy Ghost for the new spiritual life they had obtained, for the "new heart and new spirit" which were given them, or, as it is commonly called, for their regeneration. In this way they well understood and felt that as His power and grace by the Spirit was in them, they could regard, reverence and love Him as being truly and really their Father, reconciled in Jesus Christ. Rom. 11: 15; 2 Cor. 5: 18-20; Col. 1: 20, 21.

In like manner they knew and believed *themselves* to be brought by this same grace into the relation of *children*, and "beloved children" (Eph. 5: 1). They were such by "adoption" (Rom. 8: 14-17). But this adoption was not one of mere form or law, as when a man adopts a stranger's child as his son or daughter. God's adoption of believers in Christ make them His children, not in name or outward privileges only, but in reality. A man may adopt a strange child as his son, and bestow upon that child all the formal advantages and immunities of a son; but he cannot change that child's heart, spirit and mind. He may train and educate the child in a way that will have the desired influence and effect in changing the disposition, manners and conduct of the child; but can do no more. God, in adoption, does more. He makes those who by their natural birth and character were aliens, and strangers, and even enemies, truly and really His children "in the spirit and tenor of their minds." By Jesus Christ He gives them *power*, not only to be called or considered as His sons, but to *become* the sons of God." (John 1: 12). And this was something which could not be effected by "*blood*," or the influence of natural descent. It could not be secured as a natural inheritance, as most Jews thought they secured it by being descendants of Abraham. (John 8: 33-39; Rom. 2: 28; Gal. 3: 7). Neither could it be secured by "the will of the flesh;" that is, by no desire or effort of man in his carnal, natural state. Nor by any "will of man," any power of moral suasion, or any assumed virtue of such ceremonial acts as man may administer at his pleasure. The entire work must be "of God." Hence He was truly and really their *Father*, and they, in their Christian character, were emphatically *His children*.

This of course was a view of the relation between God and His people, essentially new, and altogether peculiar. But those who had received their lessons of it from the lips of Jesus Himself, or



from the mouths of his inspired Apostles, readily grasped it, and fondly clung to it. They unhesitatingly and joyfully regarded themselves as members of one family or "household of faith," of which God in Christ was the common Father, and in which all the children had equal privileges.

Accordingly, in all the Epistles, they are addressed as persons familiar with this truth, and entirely ready to accept and appreciate whatever lessons of counsel or comfort might be based upon it. In all this, however, they seem to have been no way inclined to run the blessed truth into false extremes. Really and truly as God had become their Father, had begotten them, created them, so that they could be called "His workmanship," they clearly recognized and *maintained the distinction between Him, in His essential nature, and themselves*. He still remained for them *God*, their "Father in heaven," not their Father in any material, substantial, earthly sense of fatherhood. In other words, they did not fall into the absurd mistake of imagining that on becoming Christians they had somehow undergone a *substantial* change (that is a change as to real substance) in the *matter* of their inmost life.

They well knew that such terms and phrases as—

"God's offspring," Acts 17: 28, 29;

"Partakers of the divine nature," 2 Pet. 1: 4;

"We are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones," Eph. 5: 30;

Were employed to set forth *some aspects* of the nature and character of their relation to God, and of the very close and vital relation He was condescendingly pleased to hold to them. But they needed no Solomon, no Daniel, no Plato, Aristotle or Solon to teach them the true sense of such language. Common intelligence, enlightened and guided by the Holy Spirit would have no difficulty in getting at the true mind of the Spirit as revealed in those declarations. In this they were aided also by the clear analogy of faith, which helped to keep them from interpreting any peculiar expressions in a way which was in contradiction with the plain tenor of revealed truth, taken as a whole.

Hence the phrase, "offspring of God," quoted approvingly by Paul from a Greek poet, caused no perplexity in their minds. For their faith in God involved such a view of the infinite and transcendent excellency of His essential being, as shut out every

thought of a communication of His own divine substance to man, either in creation or regeneration.\* They fully understood the expression, taken in a Christian sense, to teach that man owed his existence and nature immediately to the will, power, and goodness of God.

In like manner the declaration "made partakers of the divine nature" did not mislead them into any gross pantheistic error, of supposing that as Christians there had been transmitted to them any portion of God's substance. Indeed, such a thought could not enter into the minds of those who had learned their views of God, and His relation to His people, from Jesus Christ and His Apostles; who had been taught and who held, that even Jesus Christ, "the only-begotten of the Father," was not formed as to His human nature by an emanation from the substance of the Godhead, but of the flesh and blood of Mary; who knew and believed that true Christians, as the spiritually renewed of the Lord, "born of the Spirit," were "born again (or regenerated), \* \* \* by the word of God, \* \* \* even the word which was preached by the Gospel." Wherefore they readily and truly understood St. Peter's declaration, quoted above, as teaching a doctrine of the believer's participation of the divine nature, wholly consistent with that of man's original creation "in the image of God," consistent with every other related doctrine which he and the other Apostles taught according to the words of their Lord, and by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; and above all, consistent with the solemn truth, that "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His," though he may have been baptized by James in the Jordan, and participated daily, for three score years and ten, in "the supper of our Lord."

They were under the power as no "vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely so called" (1 Tim. 6: 20†), which led them astray from the truth, or bleared their vision in the study of it. When the true heavenly sower cast into their minds and

\*Tertullian, 200 years later, taught that "God made man of His own substance with regard to the soul," just as was taught in the *Mercersburg Review* not long ago. But Augustine severely condemned Tertullian for teaching such an abominable doctrine.

•"Oppositions," (that is antitheses) not only because they were utterly opposed in themselves to pure Gospel doctrine, but were brought forward in antagonism to it. They were the cunning, seemingly profound conceits of false teachers, who imposed errors upon people by the crafty arts of sophistry. They claimed to be preeminently scientific, learned, philosophical, boasted of a deeper mystical knowledge than the Apostles possessed. See Lange's Comm.



hearts "the good seed of the kingdom," no enemy passing that way had succeeded in putting tares in place of the wheat, so that instead of doctrines of grace they brought forth doctrines of Satan.

In the simplicity of their really intelligent faith, they understood right well, how they could "partake of the divine nature" *in a way which for those called to be* "wise unto salvation," to be "children of God by faith" and to be forgiving, perfect and "holy as God their Father in heaven is holy," was of far higher account than that they should be puffed up with the pantheistic conceit that they were "gods" (Gen. 3: 4, 5, "And the serpent said, \* \* \* ye shall be as gods,") because a germinal portion of the substance of the Godhead was assumed to be imparted to them.

By the same light and guidance of the spirit, and law of interpreting the language of the Scripture, Primitive Christians were enabled to show the error of the absurdly literal sense of Eph. 5: 30 (and we may add of the precious passage in John 15: 1 &c., the vine and the branches) which sacerdotal and pantheising high-church-men adopt and love to retail.

If the subject thus far considered has proven as interesting to our reader as to ourselves, they will not complain at our devoting another article to it.

---

## FELLOW-HELPERS TO THE TRUTH.

### A WORD TO THE LAITY.\*

Every intelligent Christian knows and admits that as certain things are needful for the upbuilding and the spread of Christianity, for maintaining proper order and discipline in the Church, and for its growth, so it is needful that there should be certain *offices*, and hence *officers*, to whom the special care of such things should be formally committed. All know, also, that such offices have

---

\*The term *Laity*, as commonly used to designate a merely formal or official difference between ministers and the people, may be allowed for practical purposes. But as Papists and high-churchmen generally use it, it is not only unwarranted by the Scriptures, but is every way objectionable. The Gospel recognizes no sacerdotal class or caste as distinct from and above the people.

been divinely instituted, and that those who may be called and appointed to fill them, are invested with the requisite formal authority to execute their trust.

Accordingly, all are ever ready to cherish and show due respect for those who may be appointed to such offices, not merely from regard to the office, but also because they "esteem them (personally) highly for their work's sake."

At the same time, however, care should be had by all, not to fall into the mistake of supposing that the existence of such special offices *excuses other members* of the church from all responsibility in regard to the particular duties to be performed. This mistake is very often made. In regard to some points, or duties, it has become the prevailing sentiment of Christians. And there is ground for saying, that the mistake, in such instances is promoted and encouraged by office-bearers themselves, from unnecessary fears of interference with their authority, and perhaps an unworthy jealousy for their own influence and honor.

Here is a subject requiring notice. It may be a delicate one, and demand careful treatment, lest some should fanatically pervert the matter. Nevertheless it deserves attention, and by calmly and diligently considering all sides of the case, the true doctrine upon the subject may be surely learned.

#### *The Mistake,*

as intimated above, lies in supposing that because there are certain special, formal offices, or ministries in the church, all but those called to those offices, are in every respect excused from the work assigned to them. For instance, many seem to think that because there are special "ministers of the word," invested with formal authority to teach and preach the Gospel, the members generally have *nothing* to do in this respect; that *the whole matter of doctrine* is exclusively in the hands and absolutely under the control of those ministers, and that the people have *nothing* to do but to listen, learn, and submit.

In like manner it is supposed, or at least practically held, that because there are, and need be, *elders* and *deacons*, *all* the work pertaining to those offices should be done by those who fill them, and that the other members should not only keep from improperly interfering with their work, but need give themselves no concern at all about it.



That this is a great mistake in regard to certain duties of elders and deacons, must be evident upon the least reflection. If "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction" (James 1: 27); and if—"bear ye one another burdens" is a command for all who would "fulfill the laws of Christ," (Gal. 6. 2); then assuredly it is no more the sole duty of the elders or deacons to visit and minister to the afflicted and needy, than it is the sole duty of the captain in an army to do the fighting, or a judge to maintain social order and justice. According to the Gospel principle and rule, all are bound to coöperate, according to their several gifts and ability, in every department of Christian work. To *secure* the performance of the work, and its being done in an orderly and effective way, it needs to be done under proper direction and regulations, and hence under the official supervision of duly authorized persons, such as ministers, elders, and deacons. But this arrangement, instead of being intended as a substitute for general Christian work, is rather meant to enlist and incite all to the highest and best measure of activity.

Of all this now a special application may be made to the duty of Christians, to be

*Fellow-helpers of the Truth,*

by aiding in the spread of the knowledge of the truth, and more particularly by *coöperating actively for its maintenance in Gospel purity.*

It is taken for granted, of course, that they have and love the truth; that they are fully persuaded of it in their own mind, and realize the importance of having all men made personally acquainted with it.

That all true Christians are, or ought to be, of one mind and heart in regard to this matter, will hardly be questioned. If this be admitted it will follow, clearly, that all are in duty bound to do all they can for the universal spread of the knowledge of the Gospel among men. This duty, so evidently reasonable and proper, is enjoined in the Scriptures by explicit and implied precepts, and illustrated and enforced by many strong and cheering examples.

Under the Old Testament dispensation, all parents were to be teachers of their children, masters of their servants, and neighbors

of each other. All were to be witnesses for God. The work of instruction in truth and righteousness, according to the will and revelation of God, though under the special supervision of designated officers, was not to be confined to them, but was binding on all.

Under the New Testament this principle and rule were so far from being abolished, that they were intensified, and established upon higher and firmer ground.

The duty is distinctly implied in the very calling and profession of a Christian. As such he is to do all the good he can to all men. But what greater good can he do to any, than to lead them to the saving knowledge of "the truth as it is in Jesus." Each is to fit himself as far as possible with ability to admonish, teach, persuade men in this way. (See Math. 5: 14-16; 1 Peter 2: 9; Col. 3: 16; Hebrews 3: 13; 1 Thess. 5: 11, 14; 4: 18, &c).

For illustrative examples we need only refer to Acts 8: 4-8; 11: 19-21; Romans 16: 3-12).

But in full agreement with this important duty is that other, of helping the cause of Gospel truth by

*Guarding its Purity.*

By this is meant that all Christians, all true members of "the household of faith," should feel themselves equally concerned for the maintenance and preservation of the great doctrines of the Gospel in their *purity*, as clearly taught in the Scriptures.

This duty belongs, of course, officially to ministers and elders; and no other member of the congregation who has proper regard for order, will deny them any right belonging to them in this respect. But the burden of this responsibility does not rest solely upon them, neither should they be expected or required to bear it alone. Here, too, every member has a part of the burden to bear; and a very solemn duty to perform.

This is evident from what our Lord says, in words addressed to *all* His disciples or followers: "Beware of false prophets" (Matt. 7: 15; 24: 11, 24.) It is further confirmed by such apostolic admonitions as the following:

Rom. 16: 17 "Mark them which cause divisions (heresies) and offences *contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned*, and avoid them." Ephes. 4: 14: "Be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of



men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

Philip 3: 2, "Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision" (that is, Judaizing teachers who tried to introduce ceremonial ritualism into the Christian church).

Col. 2: 8, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."

1 Cor. 16: 13, "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."

Philip 1: 27, "Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind (i. e. unanimously) *striving together for the faith of the Gospel.*"

2 Peter, 3: 17, "Beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness."

1 John, 4: 1, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world."

2 John, 8, "Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things (doctrines especially) which we have wrought."

Jude 3, "Earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." (See verses 20-25).

These and similar admonitions, it must be noted, are addressed to all the members of the Church, and make the duty of seeing well to the maintenance of pure doctrine in themselves and in others. The people are not to be captious, but cautious, not to be ever on the lookout for occasions of unfriendly criticisms and complaints, but to be earnestly and zealously watchful against all perversions of the Gospel, and all artful attempts to introduce hurtful errors.

*This is Right*

in every view of the case. Not only do Christians owe this duty to the *injunctions* of the Scriptures, but to their immediate, personal interest in the Gospel. The doctrines of the Gospel are the property of the whole household of faith. They do not belong exclusively to the ministry. Papists and high-church men claim such a prerogative, may and do usurp such authority over the truth. But they do it in the face of the Word of God. Even Paul says: "Not for that *we* have dominion over your faith." And again, he challenges the Galatians to test his own

preaching, and charges them that if they ever should discover that he had gone so far astray as to preach any other Gospel than that he had preached, they should resist and reject it as accursed.

It is a matter of the greatest importance to all Christians, that the uncorrupted Gospel should be upheld and defended among them, and that error should be withstood. They had better lose their houses, lands, and all earthly good, than their pure faith.

Surely, then, they should guard what is or ought to be so "precious a faith" to them. They had better have no preachers, than false teachers.

The Bible and its heavenly truths are *theirs*, and they should be jealous of the treasure, and prove how much they prize it, as bearing God's Message of Grace to them in Jesus Christ; as the written, inspired, authoritative revelation to them of those things which are dearer than life.

Some may object to the people setting themselves up as judges, and, again, to such an unlimited exercise of private judgment. But the objection is only a specious fallacy.

The people do not, in such case, set themselves up as judges, but they call on God, through His Word, as judge. They do not exalt private judgment, but they test the private opinions of others (false teachers) by the divine standard placed in their hands. A man may not be able to make fine cloth, but he can measure it with a yardstick, and he may have means of testing its quality. It is not necessary to be a baker to be able to tell whether bread is sweet or sour, heavy or light.

The Word of God is a balance in which any true and earnest Christian may weigh doctrine taught. It is a line and plummet which all may apply to what is pressed upon them as divine truth.

*And it is often necessary*

for Christians to do this. Even those who may have attained to the office of teachers in the church may err from the Gospel. The Scriptures declare that many did so, even as early as the times of the Apostles. It is sadly known that Popes, and archbishops and bishops, and whole councils of them have done so.

When this is the case, the only earthly hope left, is for the people to take the matter in hand, as they did largely in the 16th century. They may be instruments in the hands of God of saving the blessed faith of the church. Paul admonished Christians of



Galatia to do this ; and probably if he were living now he would exhort many belonging to churches in our day to do the same.

Recent news from England reports that Christians of the Episcopal Church there, both in and outside of the Parliament, are beginning to move earnestly in this direction, against the abominable schemes of the Puseyites. The people are getting weary of seeing their church distracted by the Romanizing efforts of those deceivers, and false teachers ; are growing weary of apostasies from their church to Popery, by the attempts to introduce ritualism into their church. And the zeal of the people is a ray of promise amidst the dark prospects of their Church. Puseyite ritualists, and especially the leaders, are beginning to tremble for their bad cause.

Shall we learn a lesson from all this ? Is there any need of our people rising up calmly, dispassionately, meekly, but yet most earnestly, and doing likewise ?

---

**"I AM FOR PEACE."**

So said the warrior King David, and so echoes the editor of *Our Church Paper*, published at Pittsburg, and edited by Dr. Russell—a paper in some sort the organ of the Synod of Pittsburg. The simultaneous cry for peace from our authorized Church papers, is rather an amiable feature of current events in *our* Reformed Church ; whether, however, it be ominous of a more desirable state of affairs in the future, we would scarcely venture to say. As it falls in with a prevalent feeling in the Church, it may at least mark a concession to the people and be the index of "a new departure", when militant doctors cry out for a cessation of polemical hostility. Our attention in this article is directed only to two articles in the paper just named, of the date of August 1, 1874—one entitled "One way to peace"—the other, "Working up the case;" and both are doubtless from the pen of the editor. While we have no right to question the sincerity of the writer, yet the tone and even the words of these articles seem to us to be

strangely incongruous with the subject in hand ; and they are to us strange words, and a harsh, sharp spirit in which to advocate peace. Yet all this may grow out of the fact that we are strangers to the peculiar habit of thought and the spirit that is engendered by the past relations of the writer. In changed surroundings it is possible that such tone and such words may breathe the very aroma of Christian affection and melt the obdurate and the erring. It may be so—we are not competent to say. After reading the article, we are not sure but even a stranger in *our* Jerusalem could discern with which party or “tendency” the writer’s sympathy was, and on which side it is that he surmises the wrong doers are to be found that he proposes to handle so lovingly. In stating his case, it is true the writer talks of the truth spoken in *love*, but if his is the proper mode of doing this thing—if his words are the echo of *that* affection, we prefer some one else to tell us the truth who should not be so profuse in his use of vehement adjectives—not use the red-hot and hissing kind so freely. As so much trouble has grown out of quotations recently—so many ugly charges and personalities that even outraged the sanctity of the grave, we shall not make many quotations from the articles we have named. We would not wrong an enemy, much less a brother, and therefore will assume the responsibility for mistakes ourselves, and propose to give not the words, but the intent and meaning of the author. We may not better our case, yet we mean to be just toward Dr. R.

On reading the articles named we understand them to admit, as does the title of the first one, that there is contention, division, alienation and strife in *our* Church, to a degree that hinders its proper action, and that creates an unhappy and unseemly state of affairs that needs a remedy. This, we suppose, will not *now* longer be denied by any one, although it is only a recent concession to this fact—a concession to the presence of a power that has waked those most assured that they were the Church, and not affected by “miserable factions.” We further understand these articles to say, that for this sad state of things there is no adequate or justifiable ground—that it has been written up and talked up as was the secession war of the Rebellion, by such as aspire to be leaders and champions of factions, and that these with a wicked and devilish spirit have worked up this case by a well concerted plan. If correct, this is not only a sad but an unusual case. The



charge is a very grave one. That God should allow his Church to be so afflicted without an adequate real cause, surprises us. Is there nothing in its condition that has given occasion for this storm? Besides, it seems unusual that a "miserable faction," made up of ciphers, should in their vain and empty selves have power thus to waste or destroy God's heritage. Dr. Russell's philosophy takes too shallow hold when he finds no deeper cause for the Church wrongs than the vanity and ambition of a few wicked aspirants to leadership. When he wrote that second article and condensed his charges, he should have been well assured of their truth. But such have been and are the associations of the writer that he should be competent to speak for those in whose counsels he stands and of whose movements he possesses the data for such judgment. While we should have to believe this of those to whom we stand opposed with sorrow and regret, we cannot shield them from Dr. R.'s attack; but on the other hand we may say for those whose confidence we have, and who are known as the defenders of the doctrines of the Reformed Church against *avowed* innovation and the evident attempt to subvert her established customs, we do speak for them, and say that Dr. Russell is mistaken, to use no stronger term, and is an accuser of his brethren, and makes his allegations against personal character, although indirect, yet without sufficient data. If the writer of "One way to peace" knows of this spirit of leadership and this working up a case of strife and disunion, apart from those he affiliates with, he has discerned deeper purposes than we have. We are able to find better and more worthy motives for the actors in this most unhappy business—love of their *own* Church—zeal for the truth of its doctrines—affection for its customs and rights—or if not these, a sense of duty to contend for "the faith"—if not these even, a mistaken sense of duty or zeal for peculiarities unwisely valued might account for these results so much deplored. Could not the past history of the Church warrant these as the more charitable judgment? But those who cry for peace must be allowed to judge.

But to come to this "*one way to peace.*" If we rightly understand this peacemaker—it is to have an ecclesiastical law suit—to challenge the parties in the Church to prove their case—to bring to trial the party or the persons who are the cause of the strife, and condemn them. He demands that those who would be

true to themselves and the truth of Christ, if they believe the case on either side to have weight, should bring it to an issue in this way—to challenge the champions who have gotten up the case of strife, to prove their cause before Classes and Synods. But if all prove to be fustian and words, then be done with it and let no dog more open his mouth. Words these that are bravely and easily spoken, but how can this result be reached? Why does not Dr. Russell furnish us the facts on which to determine whether the case has weight such as to make it expedient thus to deal with it? Why does he not afford us the proofs by which to identify those who should be accused before the tribunals of the Church? Surely so grave troubles must have definite cause and known authors. But if it proves only a war of words—if only a row worked up by theological demagogues, please indicate how it shall be hushed and gotten out of our churches? If the gravity of the wrong demands a trial of the offenders, who shall arraign them before the court? Can either one of the authorized “tendencies” be made to do it to their real or supposed champions or leaders? Can those who worked up the case be made to do it? So far, no party or person, no court or corporation has attempted or proposed this directly. Can any one be induced to do it? *No one can be compelled to do it!* We ask the peacemaker this question: Does there reside anywhere power to compel this worked up case to appear by its authors or abettors in court to challenge? If not then, why should not the editor of “*Our Church Paper*” take this one step toward peace, and volunteer to lay the matter before some competent court of our Church and try those who are offenders in the matter and have them justly condemned and punished? In his capacity of a grand juror in the courts of the Church or as a retiring President, cannot he do as was done at Hagerstown? It seems the way should be open to bring the authors of “this devilish business” to account, by some one who has the nerve of Dr. R. It is, we hold, the duty of any one qualified, who imagines this to be “one way to peace” to move in any court of the Church having jurisdiction. The editor, if we recollect aright, has fitting experience for such work. If we are not mistaken, our recollection is, that in the attempt to immolate Dr. Bomberger, at Hagerstown, he was a prominent actor, and we still shudder at the evidence of the sanguinary desire for peace shown in that case. We submit, who so well fitted for the delicate



and agreeable offices required to compass this "one way to peace," as our brother who so lovingly planted the stake and fired the pile on which with gentle hands was laid that proto-victim for peace. We now summon Dr. R. to this well planned way, and the church will await with interest to learn whether he will assume the heroic service and crush out this "*devilish business*" of loving and defending an assailed church, and give quiet, room and time for the work of those who would steal her faith and surrender her to the embrace of error.

While awaiting the result of our call, we take exception to an incidental conclusion reached by the editor. After demanding that in this case some *one* of those who make charges of offense should formulate them, and bring those who worked up the case in the "*devilish business*" to trial and condemnation, and *that until this is done, that it is right to disbelieve all and every charge*. We understand this to mean, that until the opposers of Mercersburg Theology—who charge that system with error, and as working injury to the Reformed Church—shall bring to trial and condemn before the legitimate tribunal, those so charged, all the allegations made should pass for slander, or to be at least undeserving of credence. As for putting these charges in form there need be no trouble; that has been done specifically and the proofs cited. But now with their charges formulated and ready to make them good, *where shall the court be found to try the case*. The case has been carried already before the church at large and a verdict given that reassures those who love and defend the truth. Now does Dr. R. demand that a trial shall be had before a partisan court of either side? Can he find any other? In the Reformed Church can there be found a panel before which *this* case would not be prejudged? What moral or doctrinal value would an acquittal or condemnation have before the Lancaster Classis East, or the Synod of the United States, or even the Synod of the Potomac, for the parties in the Church of Christ? Would it be better before the classis of Philadelphia or the Synod of Ohio? The consciousness that through the infirmity of human nature justice was not had by the parties, for or against, would at once bar the possibility of peace as the result. *Would a "tendency" that has feared to have its "order of worship" go before the Classes of the church for approbation or rejection be willing to have the authors of that tendency tried for heresy by the classis of North*

Carolina, Philadelphia, or the Ohio Synod. Could, on the other hand, the classis of North Carolina, so uniformly and persistently an enemy of innovation—Lutheran, Puseyite, Ritualistic and Roman—be ready to have its conduct in this matter tried before the Synod of the United States, or would his friends or the the church at large believe that Dr. Bomberger could here be satisfactorily tried for his championship—his working of the case—for his part in the “*devilish business?*” When we thus write, we do not wish to insinuate that these church courts would not be as just and fair as any other in the same case. But why try to show the absurdity of hoping to reach peace by this *one* way? We appeal to Dr. R., as a student of Church History, or as one acquainted with the History of Heresies or Schismatics, and ask: *When has peace been ever reached by an Ecclesiastical trial?* It did not in the Presbyterian Church, in the case of Mr. Barnes, nor in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the trial of Bishop Andrews, for holding slaves. *Perhaps quiet* has been conquered by the convenient help of faggot and sword—the sack and the wheel—dungeon and death, but not otherwise. But the Editor may reiterate: Until you do this we will hold all your charges of error, innovation and heresy to be idle and false. We again point the learned Doctor to the History of the Church. Did Wickliffe or Huss, who brought such grave charges against the Romish Doctors, succeed in getting peace in this way? Did Luther have the authors and teachers of the errors he exposed and the heresy he denounced, although he formulated his charges, tried and condemned? If he could find no tribunal unprejudiced, why throw discredit on the charges of the Reformed ministers for believing it useless to the ends of either sound doctrine or peace to cite to *trial* the authors of the Mercersburg errors, for they are well assured they should fail, not for want of proof, but because of the constitution and the animus of the court. We submit to Dr. R. that it is no proof of the baselessness or falsehood of the charges brought against the Professors at Mercersburg and Lancaster, because those who make them do not choose to stultify themselves by arraigning the authors before a court of *their friends* and *partisans*—friends, at that, who avowedly sympathize with their doctrines and purposes. Our Lord brought, during his ministry, charges of the gravest character, both personal and doctrinal, against the leaders of his *own* church—He reasserted



them publicly—yet never once put them *in form* or brought the accused ones to trial before the Sanhedrim or any other court of His church, to have them condemned—therefore, was it correct, wise and just, and did the men of that age *have a full right to disbelieve the whole charge?* Will he go back 1,800 years and take his press to Judea, during the ministry of our Lord, and apply his articles to the parties, and the strife of that bitter and exciting age in the Jewish Church—or will he go back 500 years to Wickliffe's, or 300 to Calvin's time—or still nearer—to the time of the faithful Latimer, or John Wesley, the Methodist, and try the principles of his article in those days of strife, division and bitterness. We fear that the Doctor's eagerness to have his "one way of peace" experimented with, has made him overlook the real difficulty, and even be unjust towards those he counts offenders; for even although evil doers, they should have justice meted them.

We take issue with the writer also, in that he, to us, seems to hold that the greatest evil that can afflict the Reformed Church is division and strife. We do not make light of the wrong and wickedness of ceaseless strife and ambitious divisions, yet we do assert that the state of the Jewish Church at the beginning of our Lord's ministry—that the state of the Romish Church at the opening of the Reformation—of the English Church at the rise of Wesley, was worse than any degree of strife, contention or division could possibly make it. Our Lord—a member of the Jewish Church, nurtured in its bosom, declares that for it or the world his mission was not to send peace, but a sword—"I am come to send fire on the earth." The question is, are good men in the path of duty and faithful to God and the truth when for the sake of *quiet*—to shun strife and bitterness, they are silent, and stand still to allow errorists to destroy the faith of the church—steal away the hearts of the people from it and its worship. This is *the* question in the case, and it need not take the followers of Christ, of Paul, of Zwinglius, of Farel and of Calvin, long to decide it. The question in *our* Reformed Church is not now primarily one of peace, but of truth and right—of doctrine and faith. Who in our Church are Reformed in the sense of the Heidelberg Catechism, and its historical rites and customs? These have a right to contend for their preservation at all hazards, and to forego this duty for quiet, were wicked and disloyal to Christ and the Church in the future. Such as these must prefer strife and

warfare for the Church rather than see her quietly led away from the faith ancient by false philosophy, and her children beguiled to Rome by popish errors and a lifeless formalism.

The title—"one way to peace"—in itself must mislead. The argument of the article is not for peace, but *quiet* only. Those who really love the Church and the truth, long for peace and are not satisfied with rest. The result of a trial in *this* "one way" probably would convince none of error or of wrong—it would be an exceptional case if it did. And were the condemned party forced to submit, he would be unconvinced still, and quiet, not peace would follow, it may be, and this is all that churchly power can do either by its *moral* or its borrowed *physical* power. The fire would still burn in the heart—the love of Christ and His truth, though covered with ashes, would smoulder to break forth anew. For the purpose of "securing the service, energy, talents and measure of faith and love of our whole Church to carry forward the work" of the Redeemer, more is needed than a Church trial—coercion and dread will not do it. Men to-day do not hold their faith, lives or service at the decision of a Church court.

While the writer is careful not to say who have worked up this case, and who it is that breeds this trouble, yet he does not hide his own thought. Doubtless, we do not agree in his views, yet at this juncture in the history of our Church, it does not matter so much who was in the transgression (except to follow out this *one* way) as what can now be done to avert all the terrible consequences—to stop the still active agencies—to secure *peace* to the heart of the bleeding Church. Thirty years ago warning voices were raised against Mercersburg innovations, but they were unheeded. The results were then already foretold—no difficult task—but the kindness was answered with scorn. Those who stand on the "old paths" lament these dire results—even Dr. R. is terrified by them—but have been powerless to hinder. It has only been left them to bear their testimony, to weep and to pray. If this warning protest, these prayers and these tears continued to this day, breed the churches trouble, then they are guilty. If these work up the case to its present attitude, then they plead as before, guilty, and will persist to warn off the floods and beseech God to comfort Zion. But if these troubles were bred by the persistent efforts of strangers to force on us an order of worship and doctrine that neither we nor our fathers, here or in Europe



knew, then we do not plead guilty, for we abide to-day by our fathers' faith and cultus. If the teaching in our pulpits and seminaries of doctrines on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, "even a little more than Lutheran" and verging on to Romanism, are the means by which "the case was worked up," then *we have not done it. If this Church strife has grown out of the effort to overturn the corner-stone of "the only ground of our salvation," Christ, and Him crucified, then we have not done the wrong*, and are not guilty before Christ's Church. If all these sorrows have grown out of forcing novelties upon reluctant congregations—or out of the bitter persecutions by those who may differ with us—then it was not we who put priestly power into action in our Classes and Synods to crush those who see not eye to eye with us. If this bitterness has come from the denial of freedom of speech in all matters and subjects, we have not denied it to any one, nor persecuted any one, and *for all this "devilish business" we cannot be blamed.* Yet we are ready to-day to forget *our* wrongs—to forgive Hagers-town and other sad memories of man's inhumanity to man, and to say "let us have peace"—not only quiet, but peace—blessed peace—the Saviour's best gift to His own.

We regret the tone and under-current that pervades these articles for peace. It does not make for peace. For ourselves and friends we are ready, and would with joy anticipate the formulation of charges against us and a trial, but it would not secure peace nor serve the church's best intent. The writer, we believe, did not intend it, but his articles are a rallying call to those who believe in *force* to fill our church courts with wrangling and hate. If the will of God be so, let it come. We expect to hold by our faith on the only foundation—maintain our creed as the founders held it—to worship as their custom was.

On the grounds of a stable peace, we have a word of our own to say. We submit now that, so far as Dr. R.'s "one way" is concerned, that the use of it *must* result in disaster and failure that would aggravate the wrongs of the Church and be flying from ills that we know, to those that we know not of.

This "one way" cannot be used for want of a tribunal so constituted as to be impartial in our own Church; and beyond we neither could nor would go. In any case we should have a court that is unprejudiced, that could decide the matters in controversy without fear, favor or affection, and whose verdict being above the

suspicion of partisan leaning, would be acquiesced in by both parties and received as satisfactory to the judgment and conscience. Instead of this it would, should it be determined to adopt it for the quiet of our church, and could its decisions be enforced, not secure the end needed—quiet could only be had by cutting off the condemned party; and we take it for granted that even Dr. R. and those who cry for peace, on this “one way,” are not yet prepared to avow such a wholesale mode of getting rid of those who should fall under the ban.

Judging by the past we are not sanguine as to the efficiency of *any way* to peace or even quiet. To have peace and coöperation as brothers, any adjustment of existing difficulties and hinderances must include :

1. A full, frank and explicit statement of position as regards doctrine and worship. There can be no settlement until the *real* ground of difficulty is seen, and its extent unfolded. If the difficulties are insurmountable let us know it. As long as there is a lurking suspicion that there is held a “*subjective*” and “*objective*” view of doctrine, either half of which may be put forth as convenient—as long as there is suspicion of churchly fidelity, and an apparent leaning to old Lutheranism—Puseyism, Ritualism or even Romanism in doctrines or cultus, no ground of agreement can be found. All parties must be truly and thoroughly Reformed.

2. Nor can a peace be made by ignoring all the differences of “the tendencies” as unimportant. The vein that to us seems to run through Dr. R.’s article, takes it for granted that there is no real cause for all this disquiet, and that there is no division, but that all grows out of the selfishness or the weakness of those who apprehend danger. But he is mistaken, and no such anomaly as this could exist. There must be in the depth of the soul, or on the surface in the sensibilities, that which nurtures all this activity and force. There is a difference in spirit and in form, real and earnest, that does separate the two tendencies, and no ridicule or contempt can make it small or unreal for the parties to it. There are over all the church, earnest, loving, working members of the church, who are assured that in this controversy they have all at stake that is dear to them. These must be satisfied that the foundations are safe—that their fears are guarded against, and that the church they love is safe.

3. No peace can be made that does not rest on essential agree-



ment as to the Grammatical and Historical teaching of the Catechism. Whatever departure there be in the direction of liberalism or churchliness, for this strong and well guarded means must be provided on the doctrinal system, not as interpreted by Papists of the Creed, but as understood and explained, according to the Gospel, in the Heidelberg Catechism. All must be settled that pertains to doctrine.

4. The extreme assumption of sacerdotal authority and the arrogance of Church courts must also be abated. The free, Christian spirit of our Reformed people will not brook the idea of being priest-ridden and slaves. Rome makes slaves—the Gospel makes freemen. Liberty is not only the element of their civil existence, but they cherish also the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free over against all spiritual usurpations.

5. The presence of the spirit of Christ in the words and spirits of those who seek peace, as also in the doings of the Church courts that may assay to attempt any way that leads to peace, will be indispensable. When the spirit of Christian love wells full from the hearts that seek peace, we may hope that the head of the Church will work the conditions—*not till then*. We have not forgotten or overlooked another element that might be counted in this word about peace. May not all this divergence of thought and this controversy and strife be the natural and necessary outgrowth of mental and spiritual tendencies of the age. May it not grow from the habits of thought—from the determining forces that directed the development of the mind and soul of the actors in this tragic part of our Church's history. I do not choose however to enter on this. When the truth triumphs we shall have peace. Yet peace is the gift of the head of the Church to the Churches He loves.

Let us pray for it, labor for it, and wait for it. "I am for Peace." *A Peace conquered by the Truth and Love of Christ.*

ULRIC.

---

WHERE there is more voice, more emphasis, or more gesture than there is feeling, there is waste, and worse, powder beyond shot.

## ALLEGED FABRICATIONS.

DR. J. W. NEVIN, in his article in the *Mercersburg Review* for July, where he denounces Dr. Schneck's Book, seems to have set the editor of the *Messenger* free, and given him his cue. True to his instincts, he assails the *sleeping* soldier of Christ in an article entitled, "*An Oft Repeated Fabrication*," in his paper of July 29th, 1874. It is a cowardly article; and the writer did not venture on his ignoble assault until the grave protected him from a fitting reply. In this article Dr. Fisher charges Dr. Schneck with "dishonesty" in making a quotation from the *Messenger* into his book on Mercersburg Theology, and declares the quotation to be "spurious." Dr. Fisher, and all men that knew Dr. Schneck, are well certified that he could not have resorted to such deeds as he is charged with, and the article is a reprehensible assault on the venerated deceased. The quotation may be found on page 142 of Dr. Schneck's Book, as given in the *Messenger*, but with this difference, however, that in the book it is plainly indicated, that the two sentences of the quotation are not consecutive in the Professor's article from which it was quoted, and which may be found entire in the *Messenger* for September 17th, 1873. Dr. Schneck also, on pp. 129, 130, 131 and 135, gives further extracts from the original article, and takes the utmost care not to mislead the reader or do injustice to the writer. Now let us see where the wrong is done and who is dishonest. The first member of the quotation alleged to be "spurious" and dishonest is, "A superficial study of the Heidelberg Catechism *may make* the impression, that the atoning sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross is not only essential, but also fundamental and principial, in its doctrinal system of redemption." This is clear. Any one can understand it. *Superficial* students of the Heidelberg Catechism, such as study it at Tiffin, Ursinus, New Brunswick, or, as Dr. Schneck and the other anti-Mercersburg men do, on them it makes the impression stated. But a *profound* study, such as it receives at Lancaster, Mercersburg, etc., by the professors and their friends, *on them* it does not make such impressions. It is, however, not a supposable case that any amount of *profound* study can change the facts of history or the laws of grammar. Here is what the Catechism says: "The Holy Ghost teaches us in the Gospel, and assures us by the Sacraments, that the *whole* of our salvation de-



pend upon the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross as the *only ground* of our salvation." We submit that no condition or profundity can make the terms used in the answer to the 67th question any plainer. Besides, we learn from other sources that this doctrine thus expressed was the "centre" or "pivot" of the system of doctrine held by the Reformers. It is a fact known to many "of us," that the *study* given the Catechism by the fathers of the American Reformed church, although it may have been "superficial," afforded them only this "impression." Neither was it ever called in question until strangers, by what they insolently call a profound study, discovered a meaning in it neither historical, grammatical nor scriptural. It is a fair and honest use of these words, then, to accept them as declaring that a thorough study of the Heidelberg Catechism will make the impression that the atoning sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross is not only *not* essential, but also *not* fundamental and principal in its doctrinal system of redemption. There is nothing "spurious" or "dishonest" here; is there, reader? But the wrong, says the editor, is in the use of the second member of the quotation. It does not immediately follow the first quoted sentence. So Dr. Schneck told his readers. But it is alleged that the declaration in the second member has no respect to the statement of doctrine made in the first member. Let us examine and see where the dishonesty is, and who it is that is tricky. No one will say that because the sentences of the quotations are separated by two paragraphs, that, *therefore*, they are not logically related. May not all that lies between be an amplification of the superficial doctrine of the first member. This is so, and for proof we refer any candid reader to the article. The attempt is made to show that a certain party (does not say who) are in error about the meaning of the Catechism, and puts the idea in various shapes, and to show that we cannot err in our statement, we give the main point of the paragraph preceding, and the sentence *immediately* preceding the second member of the quotation.

"From the manner in which the Heidelberg Catechism emphasises the exclusive efficacy of the death of Christ, the inference is drawn by many, that, according to the Catechism, the atonement is the principle of redemption. Assuming that the inference is legitimate, it follows that in the doctrinal system of the Catechism," \* \* \* "the cross is the pivot. It is the central sun from

which go forth light and power to every point in the sphere of redemption. The chief necessity is not the Mediator and Redeemer Himself, but the crucifixion of the Redeemer; not a divine-human person, who reveals God and redeems man, but an atoning act that satisfies the claims of the divine justice and holiness; not a new life, but a new death. *That this doctrinal system underlies and animates the Heidelberg Catechism we cannot believe.*"

This last sentence, which we italicise, is the second member of the quotation; and there can be no doubt of the meaning but that it refers, when it speaks of "*this doctrinal system*," to that system which makes the sacrifice of Christ on the cross the only ground of our salvation—which has the cross for its pivot. The quotations taken together are honest. For the leading idea of the two intervening paragraphs is in the first member of the quotation, and it is the Reformed system of doctrine that clusters around that superficial impression that our Lancaster Professor "cannot believe."

But why whine about the matter and make charges of dishonesty and call the quotation a spurious one. The whole matter is capable of a very easy and clear solution. The Professor at Lancaster says that superficial students of the Catechism *may* have the impression made that the atoning sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross is not only essential but also fundamental and principal in its doctrinal system of redemption. Now, just here, we wish Dr. Fisher to answer for the Professor whom he champions and also for himself—does such doctrinal system underlie and animate the Heidelberg Catechism? Do you, Dr. Fisher, and does the Professor, your client, *hold a system of doctrine that takes for its life, centre, pivot and sun, that Christ's sacrifice once offered on the cross is the only ground and foundation of our salvation?* If he refuses to answer this question categorically, then Dr. Schneck has in no way, even by inadvertence or misconception, done any wrong to the Professor; and the volunteered defense of Dr. Fisher was not only presumptuous but also unjust and injurious. Unless the Professor does as he or others have done, stultify himself by a contradictory statement, he must reassert that *this doctrinal system which underlies and animates the Heidelberg Catechism he "cannot believe."* There is no escape. The whole article is meaningless otherwise; and the Professor admits that a



superficial study reaches the truth of the Heidelberg Catechism. The conclusion is logical. If the Professor holds that it is a superficial and incorrect understanding of the Catechism that Christ's death on the cross is the *only* foundation of our salvation and that this is not the central idea of the doctrinal system of the Catechism, then Dr. Schneck was correct and not dishonest. But Dr. Fisher has been mistaken; we will not say dishonest. Indeed, no one but the editor of *The Messenger* would have ventured to pen so perilous an article as this, "an oft repeated fabrication." Surely he had not reread the article of the Professor, or did not care, and supposed that Dr. Schneck having gone to heaven would not unmask his artifice, and that all others had forgotten the facts. If the editor wished to draw the fire on himself and relieve his closely pressed friend by making a diversion in his favor, then he has less common sense than he has credit for. We can scarce restrain our indignation, as we write, at this prostitution of the power and impulse of the press of the Reformed Church into wronging the sainted dead and allowing it to be used to undermine the faith of the people in the doctrine of the Catechism by the Professor at Lancaster. The wrong was discerned and exposed, and now *The Messenger* shields the errorist and its own disloyalty, by assailing the dead and misleading the living who confidently expect the truth in the columns of that paper. We hope it will stimulate some of them to get and read the book of Dr. Schneck, to see how conscientious and careful he was, and learn from himself what he wrote. The article of the Lancaster Professor that has become so notorious, cannot be misunderstood, for it is written in plainer English than is usually found in emanations from that source. It is incapable of defense from a German Reformed point of view, and the Professor himself would not risk his veracity as a man or his reputation as a scholar, and say that Dr. Schneck was dishonest in the meaning he placed upon the sentence he quoted. This it was left for *The Messenger* to do, either in dull inability to understand the facts or under the supposition that no reference would be made to the documents in the case. But it will need a vast amount of craft and Jesuitical effrontery to extricate a certain Lancaster Professor from the consequences of an avowed disbelief and denial of a fundamental and "*principlal*" doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism.

KNOX.

"THUS SAITH THE LORD."

Nothing could so well serve to arrest attention to what might be spoken, as this solemn preface. Nothing could make the words so impressive, as a certified assurance that they were the words of the Lord. Nothing else could command such devout consideration, such prompt acceptance as the words spoken, or such unhesitating compliance with whatever they might enjoin.

For these reasons did those who were sent with a divine message announce it with this startling and solemn declaration. As heard by those addressed it seemed to come from the lips of a man. Whether he spoke in his own name, or in the name of an earthly king, or an earthly court, temporal or spiritual, the words would sound as merely human words, expressing human opinions, uttering human judgment, or proclaiming human laws. The speaker might be regarded as a very good man, very upright and learned. The monarch or court might be acknowledged as very benevolent, just and wise. Still the things announced would only have human authority, and could carry with them no more weight than the dictates of man's reason and the decision of man's will and judgment may carry with them.

But men are fallible and often teach error. Or they are selfish, and apt to be ruled by covetousness, ambition, pride, and other perverse affections, and judge or command unjustly; even, perhaps, without knowing or intending it. Hence, their words cannot have supreme authority for their fellow-men; that is, their words cannot, as the words of mere men, claim unquestioning acceptance and submission.

There is need, therefore, for some standard, or authority, far above that of any mere man. This is graciously supplied in the "*Thus saith the Lord.*" Here, then, it is proper to ask:

*In what sense?*

*First*, in the sense that what is said is *not* given as the *opinion* or *doctrine*, or *command* of *man*. The prophet or messenger making known the duty, fact or warning announced, does not pretend that he is giving utterance to his own thoughts, convictions or commands; or even to his own views or belief of what may be in accordance with the mind and will of God. No true prophet or messenger of the Lord ever did or ever would arrogate



such authority, or dare to impose his mere private notions as divine declarations.

Doubtless, Moses, Isaiah, and all the ancient prophets had their own personal opinions upon many important matters of doctrine and duty, beside such things as were directly revealed to them as messages to the people from their God. But they well understood the great difference as to dignity, certain truth, and authority, between the conclusions of their own reason, and the inspirations of heaven.

This point is significantly illustrated by Paul, who expressly distinguishes between truths immediately received by him from the Lord, and his own private judgment, and plainly wishes those addressed to consider it accordingly. (Cor. 7: 6, 12, 25).

And as neither an Isaiah nor a Paul would announce their own opinions or judgments as a "*Thus saith the Lord*," it will be clear that no council, or synod, or ecclesiastical court should assume the liberty to do so, in regard to any act or conclusion of their own, and for which no explicit or undoubted warrant from the Word of God could be produced, or unless it could be shown that a *special* revelation from God had been granted in the case—as was done at the first assembly, *i. e.* synod, of the Christian Church, described in Acts 15.

*Secondly*, however, the true import of the declaration is, that what is thus announced is immediately and entirely the Word of the Lord, as though uttered by His own voice from heaven, or, like the tables of stone given to Moses, written with His own hand. The prophet or messenger speaking the words, was but the medium of communicating it, as it were the mouthpiece of God. Whether it was a command, or a prophecy, or a threatening, it was wholly and directly from God. As such it was proclaimed, and as such to be regarded and received. In this consisted its divine authority as well as its most certain truth. It was this fact that made the message so solemn, and any disregard or rejection of it so sinful.

*To whom does the Lord speak?*

In the majority of cases where the phrase occurs, it is to the *people at large* that the message is addressed. What He says is meant for them, and is to be told them as He commands it to be spoken. He is their Lord, and they are His people, and He is pleased to make His will known directly to them. Not one

merely, human jot or tittle is to be added to His message, or taken from it. The people are to know assuredly, and without doubt, that it comes from Him, and that it is precisely what He wishes them to hear, believe and obey.

In matters involving His own glory, and the salvation of men, the Lord does not leave His people to the uncertain and unreliable judgment and opinions of men. They need "a sure word of prophecy." He graciously provides for their need. And now for every article of faith essential to salvation, and for every duty indispensable to vital piety, He has furnished them with an explicit "Thus saith the Lord."

But what shall be done if

#### *False Prophets and Teachers*

arise, and seek to enforce *their* views by a "thus saith the Lord?"

This difficulty and danger were foreseen. From the numerous statements in the Scriptures in regard to this evil, it would be a sadly common one. It is denounced as one of the most grievous and hurtful sins which a man could commit. And all that could be done has been done by the Lord to secure His people against the harm which such false prophets and teachers might do.

1. There are many earnest warnings against them, by which God puts His people on their guard, lest they should be deceived by such prophets of lies, and teachers of error. Those warnings are in many instances very explicit, pointing to the quarter now which such false teachers are likely to come, and how they will generally operate.

2. Furthermore, they are *described* by certain *traits* and *characteristics* by which they may be detected and known.

1. They quibble with and pervert the plain meaning of the Scriptures. Jer. 14:14. Acts 20:29.

2. They are fond of using great swelling words, deceitful, ambiguous terms, calculated to confuse the minds of the unwary and simple-hearted. They thus make a great show of learning, profound philosophy, and subtle science, whereby to dazzle and blind the eyes of people. Ezek 13:22; Jer. 50:6; 2 Cor. 11:3-15; Gal. 1:6-8; Eph. 4:14; 1 Tim. 1:3; 6:3, &c.

3. They are self-seeking, ambitious, and covetous, seeking to make merchandise of religion, and to convert the Church into a means of exalting and magnifying themselves, under cover of



*Gerhart on Baptism in the Country Papers.* 531

securing Christ and His cause. Rom. 16: 17; 2 Peter 2: 14-19, &c.

4. They are intolerant towards those who maintain the truth ; and if they happen to have the power will persecute them even to the death, as did the prophet of Baal under Ahab, and as the false prophets of Popery have always done.

3. A third means of security against false teachers, is found in what is now often called the *self-authenticating power of the Scriptures*, or of the great facts and truths of the Scriptures, to the spirit of believers. That is, in familiar terms, the internal evidence of the Bible of its divine authority, and import to the spirits of true believers ; or the witness of the Spirit to their spirits as to its divine truths. This is an inner test for every Christian heart, which is truly under the influence of the Spirit, and meekly yields to his teaching through the Word. In this case, however, great watchfulness must be exercised against self-deception.

4. But the surest way to detect them, is to try their false doctrines by the Word of God. That is the highest standard, and severest test of truth. And that is a standard put into the hands of the whole Church. False teachers will of course (as said above) appeal to it, also, and by perversions seek to make it serve their purpose. But the fraud and deception may generally be detected.

Let every one see to it, therefore, that he has a plain and indubitable "thus saith the Lord," for every fundamental doctrine held and for every essential duty performed. Then shall "our faith not stand in the wisdom of men (at best a sandy foundation), but in the power of God.

---

GERHART ON BAPTISM IN THE COUNTRY PAPERS.

NO. 2.

The following communication by "Justitia" is a continuation of Gerhart on Baptism in the country papers. Some notes on the same will now be in order.

*The Error Once More.*

It is not material who "Justitia" of July 16 is; suffice it to say, that he does not reside in Waynesboro,' and that no one there is responsible for his article.

"H" in his reply overlooks the distinction between "being engrafted" and "appropriating." 1. No one would say that the two are identical in natural grafting. The first act is grafting or setting; the second, taking up or appropriating the life of the tree—so now in spiritual grafting. First, the engrafting, as all Protestant confessions say, (2) then the appropriating of the divine life of Christ into which the subject was engrafted. What "H" says of this appropriating is all true, but he overlooks another equally important side, viz., the engrafting. It would have assisted the reader if, with his quotations of Ques. and Ans. from the Catechism, he had also quoted Ques. 68, 70, 72, 73, and then given the exposition of Ursinus, where, among other things, he says, "There is in baptism a double washing; an external washing with water and an internal washing with the blood and spirit of Christ." Very much like Dr. G.'s tract. Then, further, from the Art. "Baptism," from the confession of faith, Presbyterian, \* \* \* "a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his engrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in the newness of life," &c., &c. Then also the Methodist Cat. Ques. 71, 72. In addition to all these, the subject will be made still clearer, if the thesis concerning Baptism from the commentary of Ursinus is added, thus; "2. The first end of Baptism instituted by God is, that He might thereby declare and testify it to us, that He cleanses those who are baptized by His blood and spirit from all their sins, and therefore engrafts them into the body of Christ and makes *them partakers of all His benefits.*" This now by the double washing as before quoted. This language sounds very much like Dr. G. who says, as "H" had it printed in small caps, "that by baptism they are engrafted into Jesus Christ (so all the Protestant Confessions say) (2) "and are therefore made partakers of Christ and all His benefits." So Ursinus says—pretty good company. It would perhaps be difficult to tell, had Dr. G. and Dr. U. lived at the same time, which one copied from the other, the two expressions being nearly alike. Queer reading this commentary of Dr. Ursinus, the Westminster Confession; and rather good,



healthy theology, Bomberger, Good, Nast, &c., and the miserable, wretched travesty of Schneck, to the contrary notwithstanding.

Now, Mr. Editor, "Justitia" reiterates what he said in his former article, and emphatically asserts, that in this one sided way this ecclesiastical warfare in the Reformed Church has been carried on for years. Is it any wonder that there is no peace? We look for the right and shall abide the time of the good Lord when he shall bring it in.

JUSTITIA.

*Notes on the above.*

(1) The distinction between "being engrafted" and "appropriating," is one now greatly insisted upon by Dr. Gerhart and his "intelligent" followers, as the one thing that is to save his *unreformed* theory of Baptism. Their idea seems to be, that by baptism we are engrafted into Christ, and by this engrafting *necessarily* become so united to Christ as to become partakers of all His benefits. But then, afterwards, we must "actively" appropriate these benefits, this new life of Christ, or else we will again lose them, the new life will die out, and benefit us none at all. The chief thing with Dr. Gerhart and Justitia is, that the very act of baptism is one in which the outward and inward are inseparably joined together, so that we are really regenerated by the act of baptism, and that we really are made and become partakers of all the benefits of Christ. And they use this *figurative illustration* of grafting, not for the purpose of illustrating the subject, *but to prove it*, which is a very unscientific mode of procedure.

We do not grant the legitimacy of this mode of proof, but we will take them on their own chosen ground, and will show that the figure of grafting does not bear out their own theory, *but actually overthrows it*, and entirely demolishes it.

What is *ingrafting* in the sphere of arboriculture? We take a branch, scion or bud from one tree, and carefully insert it in the branch or stock of a living tree. The *act of grafting* (which, according to Dr. Gerhart, corresponds with baptism, although the Scriptures never say so,) *does not unite the scion or bud* with the stock; *does not* establish a living connection between the tree; *does not* regenerate the graft; *does not* transfer the properties or

life of the one to the other; *does not* make the one a partaker of all the benefits of the other. *It only plants the scion in the body of the stock.* The living connection is a different thing, and is formed *afterwards*. In thousands of cases this living connection is never formed. The grafting is done *for the purpose* of establishing this living connection. But the grafting itself does not do it. It only puts the scion and stock in such a position that the living union can take place. That living union does not take place *by virtue* of grafting. The inward is not joined inseparably to the outward (as Dr. G. affirms), so that where the one takes place, the other does so also. It is not the "objective virtue" of grafting that unites the lives of the two. Every one who has ever grafted or budded, knows this.

Apply this now to Baptism. The act of baptism plants us in the "body of Christ," puts us under the influence of the means of grace, so that the union with Christ may be formed, if it has not already been formed. You may call this "ingrafting," or "incorporation" (*in corpore*), but that which forms the living union with Christ himself, is *Faith*. So it is uniformly and invariably set forth in the sacred Scriptures. And so, also, it is set forth as expressly as words can make it, in our Confession of Faith, the Heidelberg Catechism. As Dr. Gerhart and Justitia do not seem to be aware of this, let us again call their attention to the 20th question: "Are all men, then, as they perished in Adam, saved by Christ? No, *only those* who are ingrafted with Him, and receive all His benefits *by a true faith*;" (the Catechism does not say "by baptism," as Dr. Gerhart and Justitia would have said, if they had had the composing of it.)

If these gentlemen will consult the Reformed Confessions in those places where they treat of justification, union with Christ, &c., they will find, *that with one voice* they hold and teach, that *by faith* and *by faith alone*, are we saved and made partakers of Christ and all His benefits. Baptism, *as such*, may plant us in the body of Christ (which is the communion of the *means* of grace), but it is faith, *and faith alone*, that unites us to Christ, so that we live in Him and He lives in us.

(2.) This writer repeatedly speaks of what "all the Protestant Confessions say." Has he ever read any number of them? We trow not. His acquaintance with them is evidently very limited. It is *not true* (as he says) that all Protestant Confessions say, "that



by baptism they are engrafted with Jesus Christ, and are therefore made partakers of Christ and all His benefits." If he makes this assertion on the authority of Dr. Gerhart, he is leaning upon a poor authority. If he had consulted them for himself, he could not well have fallen into such a blunder. The Heidelberg Catechism does not say so, but says just the contrary, (see above). *Not one* of the Confessions of the Reformed Church can he bring forward that says so, except apparently the Westminster Confession, which he quotes, but he quotes it in part only. Had he quoted the whole, it would have shown that this Confession very explicitly teaches, that regeneration is not always conjoined with the outward baptism. Let the reader judge for himself. That Confession says:

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him *a sign and seal* of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life..... Although it is a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, *or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.* The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment wherein it is administered; yet notwithstanding, by the the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, *in his appointed time.....* The grace of faith.....is *ordinarily* wrought by the ministry of the Word; by which, also, and by the administration of the sacraments, and prayer, *it is increased and strengthened.....* The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred *by any power in them.*"

The reference to the Methodist Catechism does not concern us here, as that is not one of the historical Confessions of Faith. Justitia also missed the meaning of the thesis; he quoted from Ursinus. Ursinus does not say that the act of baptism cleanses us from sin and engrafts us into Christ. But that God by it *declares and testifies* "these things, or, in other words, that they are a *sign and seal* of them, according to the uniform language of the Reformed

Confessions; and therefore "engrafts them with the body of Christ."

This writer echoes, in still stronger language, the remark of Dr. Nevin in the *Mercersburg Review*, in respect to Dr. Schneck's book. Dr. Nevin called it a "miserable travesty." Justitia calls it "the miserable, *wretched* travesty of Schneck." Several questions arise here involuntarily: 1. Has he ever read Dr. Schneck's book? 2. Does he know what a travesty is? 3. Is he not merely echoing the words of Nevin, without having the capacity to form a respectable judgment himself in the case?

That remark of Dr. Nevin has already been commented upon in the *Reformed Church Monthly* with some severity, and with still greater severity by a writer in the *Christian World*. In all honesty, we cannot say that the comments have been too severe, and for these reasons:

1. We have read that book with as much care as any book we ever read, and we affirm it to be a fair and candid exposition of the Mercersburg Theology, *as far as it goes*. And it is very significant, indeed, that no writer on the Mercersburg side has ever ventured to point out a single instance where it fails to set forth the Mercersburg system correctly, i. e. as correctly as such a jumble of inconsistencies can be set forth. The only thing that has been attempted, has been so ludicrous in its results, that the writers are by this time no doubt heartily ashamed of the exhibition they made of themselves. We refer to the charge of "garbled extracts," of which two instances were brought forward. Of the first of these it turns out that the only garbling was the addition of quotation marks in a sentence where they ought not to have been. But it is understood that some men high in the Mercersburg ranks hold that that sentence correctly delineated the Mercersburg theory, and that Dr. Gerhart yielded the *main point* when he backed down from it. Let them settle that between themselves. The other charge of "garbled extracts" was signally overthrown by the assistant editor of the *Christian World*, and Dr. Fisher retreated, *angry, and in confusion*, from the battle-field.

2. Dr. Schneck was a *good theologian*. Before the writing of that book we had supposed that his theological acquirements were not extensive; that he was rather a good preacher and general writer, than a theologian. But after a diligent study of great German writers on theology, for some years past, we have come



to the well-settled conclusion, that in acquaintance with the modern Evangelical, and Reformed theology of Germany, *both in breadth and in depth*, Dr. Schneck was the peer, yea, the superior of such pretentious men as Drs. Gerhart, T. G. Apple, and the writers in the *Mercersburg Review* generally. These gentlemen have a very superficial knowledge of that theology. They have evidently studied but little of it (and that monthly, at second hand), and they have failed to understand a great deal of what they have in some sort gone over. For example, the writer of the various articles on Ebrard, in the *Messenger* for the last few months, seems to be sublimely unconscious of the fact, that he don't understand Ebrard on the person of Christ. Ebrard's theory of the person of Christ and the Mercersburg theory, are *radically and fundamentally* different.

3. Dr. Schneck was a singularly fair-minded man, sincerely desirous of uttering nothing but the exact truth, in the book spoken of.

4. It was only after long silence and long examination that he ventured upon the task of writing that book. He knew its difficulties, *and knew well from the start* (as we gathered from his correspondence) *that he would be roughly abused by superficial theologasters*. But, after the work was done, he felt entirely satisfied that he was right, and that he had done right. No work that he ever performed gave him more unmixed satisfaction than his book on the Mercersburg theology, after he had completed it. Of this we have abundant evidence in letters from him. It throws a very damaging light upon the moral character of Mercersburgism, that it is so given to *secret* and *open* calumny upon its opponents (especially the former), and that it is now seeking to calumniate Dr. Schneck after his departure to a better world. To say that his book is a "miserable, wretched travesty," is simply a calumny, no matter by whom it may be uttered. And we ask, does that assertion make or prove the book to be such? Let him who says so, undertake to prove it. So Dr. Nevin once published in the *Mercersburg Review*, (where it stands uncontradicted to this day), the charge that Dr. Rust denied original sin and was in part a Pelagian. Was that true, and did Dr. Nevin's charge make him to be such? So now he calls Dr. Schneck's book a miserable travesty, and all the poor Justitias echo and reëcho the word.

HEIDELBERG.

## Arsinus College Repertory.

### THE IMMATERIALITY OF THE SOUL.

#### A GRADUATING ADDRESS.

The soul may be defined to be that part in man which is endowed with the power to think, to feel and to will. This feeling, thinking and voluntary agent in man, is almost universally believed to be something different from the body, and to have an existence independent of the body. This opinion is held and advocated by the majority of those who have made the greatest researches in the fields of philosophy, and who have given much of their attention to the study of the soul.

If the soul and body belong to the same order of being, or, in other words, if that mysterious power in man which thinks, and feels, and wills, is but a refined state of organized matter, it would be possessed of the same properties of which matter is possessed; be subject to the same laws, produce the same phenomena, and be designated by the same epithets. The philosopher would then not see in them properties peculiar to themselves, and thus have a reason for producing works on the study of physics separate from the works on the study of psychology. That their respective properties differ from each other, and are therefore entitled to a distinct recognition by a true philosophy, is evident. There is no similarity between joy and solidity, hope and impenetrability, sorrow and electricity, memory and compressibility, imagination and gravitation, and all the other properties that are applicable to matter and spirit. Further, all matter is capable of divisibility; it has its top and bottom, right and left side, its length, breadth and thickness. Could any particle of matter, however small it may be, be found without these and similar qualities, it would cease to be matter, and become an immaterial substance; for it is by these, and like



terms, that matter is known and classified. Now, it is clear to all, that we do not, in a mechanical way, speak of the divisibility of thinking ; of the length, breadth and thickness of a hope ; of the right and left side, and top and bottom of an imagination. Properties that are attributed to one cannot be attributed to the other ; this being true, it would be an illogical process of reasoning, and would not be advancing the cause of true philosophy to pronounce the two alike in essence.

The immateriality of the soul is indicated by its identity. The human system, in which the soul dwells and has its abode for the present, is continually undergoing a change. The particles of matter that enter into the composition of the body of the aged man, are not, or at least not necessarily so, the same particles of matter that gave form and being to his youthful stature. He is, as far as his material organism is concerned, a new being. His old tabernacle is dissolved and his soul inhabits a new structure. Even the brain, which seems to have more connection with the soul than any other part of the bodily system, is, like every other part of the material organism, subject to decay and renovation. But while man's beautiful stature is continually casting off old particles of matter and collecting new ones, the identity of the soul is preserved. This may be inferred from the fact, that every man whose mind is in a healthy condition, is able, during the course of his life, to look back upon the days of the past and recall thousands of his acts and feelings. The man at the age of seventy or eighty, with his soul dwelling in an earthly structure that has come into existence during his latter days, is conscious of hours of happiness and enjoyment which he realized during the long period of the past ; he is ever perfectly conscious of the scenes and pleasures of the days of his childhood. If the soul, like the house in which it dwells, was destitute of a permanent state of existence, man, in an ordinary course of his lifetime, would, in addition to the new body that he had lately obtained, be possessed of a new soul. This soul, lately springing up into existence, would be unconscious of the knowledge of the soul that had passed away ; consequently, man would be unconscious of his past life, which is contradicted by his daily experience. Since man is able to remember the past, we infer the identity of his soul ; and since the body is destitute of this permanent state of existence, we infer that it and soul are different in essence ; and since we apply the

term matter to the body, and to all positive created substances that are identical with it, we hesitate not to speak of the soul as an immaterial substance.

Spirit is self-active, while matter is not. Matter never changes its position or passes into a new state, except as it is operated upon by a force from without. So subject are the planets in their revolutions around the sun as the centre of the solar system to an inflexible destiny, that the mathematician, by estimating respectively their extension, quantity, force, velocity and resistance, can predict their exact position in the heavens a thousand years previous to the time of his calculation. They are subject in their movements to an overpowering allotment, borne onward in their appointed course, unconscious, and without any self-moving element. In a similar manner must all material bodies be affected before they will change the state or condition in which they may happen to be. Place a body in a state of motion, and as far as we are able to discern, it will be endowed with perpetual motion; place it in a state of rest, and it will remain in that condition until it is operated upon by an external force. But it is quite otherwise with the soul; it is impelled to action by its own energy from within. It is true it is aroused into activity by impressions being made upon the senses by some other portion of matter; but this does not cause the soul to act; it only furnishes it with an opportunity for activity. Still further, after the soul is once awakened, if matter would never provide it with an opportunity for action, it has the power, under laws of its own, to construct for itself materials of thought, and in this way busy and interest itself.

While all philosophers admit that the mind has laws under which it acts, they have been far from characterizing mind as acting under mechanical laws; and as passive in its activity, and yielding as blind and as unconscious obedience to an outward influence as the stone when drawn to the earth by the laws of gravitation. The soul is conscious of its freedom that it has a will; that it has within itself a self-determining and self-moving element. All feel and realize the truth of the sentiment of the poet when he says, "Practically we feel ourselves to be free, though in thought we can not make it out." This seems to be a universal belief, however difficult it may be to reconcile it with the idea, "there's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them



as we will." If these views be correct, we find another reason for not identifying and confounding these two existences.

It is an argument of the materialist, that the soul and body are one material organism, because the soul derives much of its enjoyment, received its primitive knowledge, and daily makes new acquisitions of knowledge through organic mediums. It is through the eye that the soul looks out and beholds this extended empire of visible creation and becomes acquainted with matter, in its various tints and diversities of colors. However beautiful the earth might be when decked in its vernal garments, to one born blind there would be no sense of the beautiful. It can readily be conceived that much of the knowledge that man now has and enjoys, could never have been obtained by him if he had been deprived of the organ of sight. The same is true in regard to the other four senses, which furnish the soul with opportunities for action. While it is true that the soul is frequently roused into a state of activity through the senses, it is also true that the greater part of the knowledge it has obtained, and the knowledge of the highest kind that it possesses, has been acquired without the aid of the senses. It, acting by the power of imagination, under laws peculiar to itself, and according to its internal constitution, has the power to construct palaces and landscape that far surpass those in beauty which it has seen through its organic telescope. It can take the wings of the morning and fly with electric speed, from state to state, from nation to nation, from continent to continent, and from earth through the ethereal regions to the home of its future destiny, while it is almost unconscious of its body and its bodily senses. In such an excursion of the soul, it is independent of impressions made upon the senses by another body of matter from without; and hence the argument of the materialist is groundless, in supposing that the soul and body are one, because the soul frequently acts through the senses.

It is strange to see what peculiar views men will advance, and often intelligent men, when they have once become blinded through prejudice, are become ambitious to support some peculiar theory to which their attention has been directed, or which they have originated and placed before the world. Man becoming ambitious to support some peculiar theory, is willing to ignore the dignity of his nature, and to give a deaf ear to that spirit within him which teaches him by its flights of eloquence

and powers of imagination, by its power to think, to feel and to will, that it is unlike this universe of unconscious matter. It seems to be as absurd to believe that man's psychical activities are the result of a refined organization of matter, as it is to believe the theory of the atheist, who would tell us that the beautiful and complicated machinery of the universe is owing to a fortuitous concurrence of atoms.

J. H. SHUFORD.

---

#### OUR STANDARD OF SCHOLARSHIP.

Several reasons prompt us to a brief consideration of this subject. Among these reasons there is one, however, the tenor of which our readers would hardly guess. It has really been made a matter of complaint, and an occasion for objection to *Ursinus College*, that our standard of scholarship is too high, and that our students are taxed too severely with their prescribed studies, and the efforts necessary to secure high numbers in their merit-sheets!

Both the complaint and the objection are as flattering to our school as they are ridiculously absurd in themselves. And it is gratifying to know, that the complaint has been made by only a very small number of our regular students, and that the objection, however vigorously employed for the purpose of harm, has proven next to futile. For it affords us sincere pleasure to testify, that thus far the great body of the young gentlemen who have been connected with this Institution, or who are now connected with it, appreciate the position of the Faculty in regard to this matter. Instead of being discouraged by the lofty aim thus set before them, they are rather stimulated by it to put forth corresponding efforts to reach the mark. They do not wish the hill of science so leveled that any one can roll along under the impetus of a slight push at the start, like a wooden ball along the smooth floor of a ten-pin alley.

If the matter is meant as an accusation, the charge is unhesitatingly admitted. The standard of scholarship in our school has been fixed at a high point. It is not admitted to be *too high*;



nor is it claimed to be higher than that of the best educational institutions in the country; but it is believed, and indeed known, to be higher than that of many others. And it is designedly so, on grounds deemed not only sufficient to justify us in the case, but which demand that the mark should be set precisely where it is. It will be sufficient to indicate some of these grounds in a few words.

*First of all*, it is not a thing of arbitrary choice, still less of catchpenny policy, to fix this standard. It involves a principle and a law. Real scholarship is what it is, and no attempted accommodation to popular wishes can make it anything else. Three sticks each, but ten inches long, can never make an honest yard; and twelve bits of lead, each weighing but half an ounce, can never make an honest pound. Any attempt to use the one or the other, as a true measure or a true weight, would be denounced as fraudulent.

As little will honesty permit the standard of scholarship to be set below an accredited gauge. Nay, it will allow it still less, in proportion as the facilities for deception or fraud are greater in the matter of education, than in cases of traffic. Few persons could be defrauded by a very short measure, or by very light weight. But many may be imposed upon by a certificate or diploma, granted to a pupil not fairly entitled to it. Even the pupil himself may be thus flattered into the deceptive conceit, that he is the master of a subject of which he scarcely knows the rudimental principles.

*In the next place*, it is due to the cause of higher education that a lofty idea of what constitutes true scholarship should be maintained and inculcated. Not any smattering knowledge of the several subjects included in a proper course of study will satisfy the just requirements of such an education, or deserves to be dignified with the name of scholarship. In this respect great wrong has been done to the interests and claims of true and solid learning. Colleges and higher schools are justly expected to know what belongs to scholarship, and those whom they send forth with letters of endorsement and commendation are taken as illustrative specimens of what such scholarship means. And if they allow low attainments to suffice, and label every one "*an educated man*" who may run slipshod through the course prescribed, and have acquired no proficiency in any branch, the

prevailing estimate of learning will be correspondingly lowered, and education will be degraded.

Doubtless, this has become too common an evil. The effect has been hurtful to the reputation of colleges, and has brought them largely into contempt among thoughtful and cultivated people. But, as intimated, the greatest damage done in the case, is that inflicted upon education itself.

*Thirdly*, it is due to *the pupil or student* that a high standard, in this respect, should be set before him. If he enters the school with the notion that by merely *looking at* his text books an hour or two a day, and sitting in the class at the appointed time, he can fully meet all demands and acquire a fair title to a certificate of commendable scholarship, the sooner the notion is eliminated from his mind the better for him. A college is the place for earnest work. The *facilities* it affords for acquiring a liberal education do not imply that the acquisition of learning is made *easy for idlers*, but placed fairly within the reach of diligent study. There will be diversity of talent, or of "aptness in learning," as is often said. But the quickest perception and the readiest memory must work, to win any substantial reward. And with proper persevering effort almost every one can secure that reward. Without this, no one ever really succeeded in becoming a true scholar. By lowering the standard, a nominal reputation might be gained, and the pupil be flattered with the fancy that he had won the race. But he has been deceived, and goes forth with a delusion which will be likely to cling to him with hurtful power, for life.

How much better, therefore, even for himself, that any wrong notion he may have regarding this point, when he enters the school, should be corrected at once. Let young men and young women who may seek and enjoy the opportunities of a liberal education, be impressed at the start with a true conception of what real scholarship is, that they may know and feel that their time at school cannot be spent in idleness, if they would indeed secure the end contemplated. This may be done without discouraging them in their work. So far will it be from disheartening them, that all who are really alive to their privileges and responsibilities, will rather feel cheered and incited by the lofty aim thus set before them.

To name no other reasons in favor of the position defended by



this article, we simply add that it is due to parents, guardian, and friends who may entrust pupils to the tuition of high schools and colleges, that such a true standard of scholarship should be faithfully maintained. They look to the circulars periodically issued for honest testimony as to the actual progress made and the real standing of the student. Shall they be deceived by that testimonial? Greatly as they might be delighted by high figures, would they not rather know the truth? Then let the standard be such that the figures, awarded fairly and impartially, according to that standard, may be relied upon as setting forth the truth.

There may, indeed, be strong temptations to an opposite course. Amidst the competitions and rivalries which are multiplying, an institution which fixes its standard at the high mark demanded by the claims of principle and truth, may forfeit popularity, and fail of patronage, for a season. Its stricter requirements and more rigid discipline may even be used to its temporary disadvantage, and employed as arguments against it. The easier and looser methods and rules of other schools may be held forth as enticements to decoy inconsiderate and frivolous youth away from its halls to their saloons.

But in the end all will come right. A character and reputation will be established which must and will secure confidence and respect. The growth may be slow, but it will be sure and enduring. And ultimately even those who may have been tempted to complain, or who may have suffered themselves to be alienated, will honor the school where pupils could not gain a glittering polish of education without being, also, true scholars.

We are entirely willing, therefore, that it should be known and published abroad, that the standard of scholarship in Ursinus College is high, and that its students must be diligent and faithful in their toils to attain it. Such a standard was considerably and designedly adopted at its establishment. And upon the maintenance of that standard it confidently rests its hope of doing well the important work in which it has engaged, and of reaping in due season a rich reward.

In fact some cheering foretastes of this reward have been already enjoyed. The two or three young gentlemen who (for reasons in no way reflecting upon the literary or moral character of the College), have gone from it to other Institutions, with testimonials showing our good estimate of their attainments, have, in each in-

stance, not only been admitted to classes corresponding with those which they would have entered here, but have taken the highest positions in those classes. Evidence like this is certainly very flattering, and may assuredly be taken as the strongest encouragement to hold our ground.

---

#### SPECIAL ITEMS.

*The Fall Term*, which opened August 31, has more than realized our expectations. There has been an encouraging accession of new students, and the number of regulars in the College classes has, with a single exception, been increased. The list of boarding students is larger than during the corresponding period last year, and more are still to come.

This will be gratifying intelligence to our friends, and especially to those of them among whom it seems from tidings which have recently reached us, the rumor was circulated that many of our regular students would desert Ursinus and seek more congenial quarters. It really has transpired that efforts (which we will merely characterize as extremely contemptible, and such as respectable politicians would despise), were made by personal visitations and appeals to draw away our students. Such means were used with quite a number of those now with us. So far as we know, but two were thus prevailed upon. And in one of the cases, at least, the reasons given for yielding to the outside pressure thus brought to bear, are far more flattering to Ursinus College than to its competitor. Altogether the result must be mortifying to the parties who, having traveled so far, and worked so hard, effected next to nothing.

The Theological Department is also thriving. In the Senior class there are four young gentlemen who expect to complete their course of study during the current year. This fact will agreeably surprise those who may have been somewhat disturbed by the absurd report, that our Theological Department was empty.

And what is better still, the demand for the young men who are known to be honestly and truly educated here, in harmony with the principles, faith and usages of the Reformed Church,



exceeds our present ability to supply it. Applications for such, in decided preference to others, are multiplying to an extent which is as perplexing, at times, as it is gratifying.

Evidently, the decidedly and openly Protestant evangelical character, success and prospects of Ursinus College, must be very annoying to parties who feel compelled to resort to special (and specially contemptible) agencies, to counteract its influence.

The friends of Ursinus are zealous for prosperity; but they work under no false pretenses, and urge no fraudulent claims. If the Institution rested on semi-Popish principles, and indirectly served the foes of evangelical Christianity, knowing it, they would confess the fact.

*Very good progress* has been made in the work of securing funds for the College. In a single rural charge, and that not a large or wealthy one, located in the near vicinity of the College, about \$1,300 were obtained as the reward of a little effort. Indeed that full amount may be received by this time. In another charge, considerably further off, nearly \$1,200 were obtained. In still another, a beginning, made by calling on but a half dozen friends, secured upwards of \$400. And so on. There is, therefore, every encouragement to go on with the good work, with the prospect of success in raising the amount needed and proposed. It will, of course, demand the earnest coöperation of all our friends. But they may well feel inspired to lend such coöperation, when they see how willing the people are to give for a cause in which they have confidence, and with which they warmly sympathize.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS—*The Theological Library* of the College is greatly indebted to the liberality and kindness of Elder *David Waltz*, of Wadsworth, Ohio, for a copy (five large volumes) of *Pfaff's Bibelwerk*, of the edition 1767. The kind donor is an esteemed member of the congregation of Rev. S. C. Goss, and has our sincere thanks for this valuable proof of his interest in our work.

Let this example prompt others to like contributions to this department of our Institution. The volumes were transmitted through the kindness of the Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D., of Lebanon.

*Received for Educational Aid.*

Rev. Eli Keller, collection in his charge .....	\$49 00
Rev. Dr. F. W. Kremer, S. S. of the 1st G. R. C. Lebanon .....	50 00
Rev. Sorber, St. Peter's congregation.....	2 46
“ “ Brownback's S. S.....	16 94
Rev. Dr. Wolff, Myerstown.....	50 00
Rev. I. S. Weisz, Paradise charge.....	67 50

*For Missions.*

Dr. G. W. Welker.....	\$10 00
Rev. J. C. Clapp, Treasurer of North Carolina Classes.....	24 00
Rev. J. B. Shumaker, St. Paul's church, Lancaster.....	51 08
Rev. H. Hartman, Tamaqua.....	22 00
Rev. Eli Keller, collected in his charge... ..	73 00
Rev. I. S. Weisz, collected in his charge.....	50 00
Rev. J. Sechler, collected in his charge.....	50 00
Per Elder Wolff, Abbottstown congregation.....	26 50

*Church Extension.*

Rev. Geo. Wolff, Myerstown .....	\$ 10 00
Total .....	\$316 58

F. W. KREMER,

Treasurer of Church Aid Committee, Ursinus Union.

## EDITORS' DESK.

BUSINESS NOTICES.—*As our friend Mr. Pearsol has not yet effected the necessary arrangements for assuming the financial care of the Monthly, subscribers will please remit their dues directly to us.*

*All in arrears are again urged to forward the amount due at once. Let no further appeal be necessary.* Having now a POSTAL ORDER OFFICE in our immediate vicinity (Collegeville P. O.) money in small sums can be most safely and conveniently sent in that way. Address—

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Mont., co., Pa.

*The Reformed Church Monthly for 1875.*—Taking lessons from the exemplary zeal of other publications, we solicit our friends to make suitable efforts



for increasing the circulation of the Monthly, and so enlarging its sphere of usefulness. Now is a good time to put forth efforts for this purpose, so that it may start its eighth year with January, 1875, encouraged by the results of such efforts.

If all who have assured us of their warm approval of its principles, aims and course, and have appreciated the service it has rendered to the cause it advocates, will lay hold of the matter, it would be easy to secure 1,000 additional subscribers.

To stimulate them, if needful, to make the attempt, we offer the following special terms, for the next three months: We will furnish new subscribers—

6 copies for 1875 for.....	\$10
12 " " " " .....	19
20 " " " " .....	30

and all above 20 copies on the same terms. Those who subscribe now will receive the November and December numbers gratuitously.

The *Monthly* does not pretend to take the place of *The Christian World*, our weekly religious paper. But in the main they work hand in hand, each meeting a want in its own way. The *Monthly* furnishes articles of permanent value, and can be easily preserved for future reference.

Back numbers and volumes can be furnished. Single numbers (postage prepaid) 20 cts. Back volumes (postage prepaid) \$2.00.

#### REASONS FOR TAKING IT.

It is a monthly periodical of 56 pages, making a volume of 672 pages a year, which can be easily preserved and bound at the end of the year.

*Its great object* is to set forth, maintain and defend the long settled faith and practice of the Reformed church, the principles and doctrines of the church, and to do this in opposition to all efforts made to change both and to introduce high-church, sacerdotal, Ritualistic and Romanizing errors.

*In its matter* and style, it may be called a practical, popular Review, calculated to instruct the reader upon subjects of vital importance, to strengthen them in the faith, and to warn and fortify them against deceitful, misleading errors.

*Every member of the Reformed Church* should take it. It supplies them with substantial and profitable articles, such as are not usually published in a weekly paper.

*It costs* but \$2 a year, and for that sum gives more original reading matter than any other religious monthly we know of.

*Try it* for one year, and, like nearly all others who have done so, and love the old faith more than attempted innovations, you will hardly give it up.

*The Challenge Reiterated.*—The *Monthly* for September noticed the shameful and contemptuous assault made by the Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D., upon Dr. Schneck's book against Mercersburg Theology. In that assault the book is denounced as a "travesty," and as containing "garbled quotations." We

pronounced the assault to be utterly unwarranted and false, and challenged the assailant or his special friends to the proof. An offer was made to publish any article they might write in defense of the calumny upon our departed brother, in the *Monthly*, provided our reply or replies (one for each of their articles) would be published in the *Reformed Church Messenger*.

Thus far no notice has been taken of our challenge or offer. The slander is published and then is allowed, unchecked, to run on and do its malicious work. But it cannot be permitted to escape by such cowardice.

Hereby we renew the challenge. And to show that we are in earnest about this matter, we make this additional offer:

1. For every fair proof that Dr. Schneck's book is a travesty of Mercersburg Theology (of which Dr. Schneck is the principal father), or for every "garbled quotation," fairly shown to be such, pointed out in the book, we will pay *Five Dollars* to any *Mission* of the Reformed Church which they may designate; provided,

2. That for every quotation we can cite from Dr. Schneck's book (setting forth some peculiar view of Mercersburg Theology) which is *not garbled*, and for every proof we may advance that his book is not a "travesty," &c., Dr. J. W. Nevin or any of his associates, will pay the like sum of *five dollars* to such *Mission* or *Missions* of the Reformed Church as we may designate.

Under this challenge, or any other fair one they may make, let them meet the issue like men.

It seems to us about time that the Church should no longer be lulled into false confidence, or deceived and misled by the mere sweeping, calumnious denunciations of those who seek to evade *proofs from their own writings* of their grievous departures from the faith they are pledged to maintain, by decrying such proofs as a travesty and slanderous misrepresentation.

From first to last, Dr. Schneck's book is a true, fair, and fully sustained exposure of the anti-Reformed character of the Theology (or whatever it may be called) which Dr. J. W. Nevin and his associates have been advocating for the past ten or fifteen years. And if the parties named have but half the intelligence claimed for them, they know this assertion to be true. It is vain for them to try (as recently) to cover up their tracks by plausible articles which make a fair superficial show. Such ruts as have been made by their innovations for years past, will require more filling up than many reams of speciously printed paper can supply.

If they have indeed and truly seen their errors, radically changed their views and heartily returned to the forsaken faith, none will more sincerely rejoice than those who have felt constrained hitherto to oppose them.

But let there be open, frank confessions of such a change, if it has taken place. They should not shrink from making them. And if they have earnestly changed back in good earnest, they will not shrink from unequivocally acknowledging it.

---

"*I am for peace.*"—*Ulric*, in the present number, has furnished an article under this caption, which, though somewhat lengthy, will amply repay perusal.



We hope all will read it. It hardly allowed of division, and it was concluded to be best to publish it entire in a single number.

*We* are all for peace, and quite as earnestly, to say the least, as Lancaster, or any of its friends can be. But every one can see that a mere outward peace, compromising the faith and principles of the Church, and conniving at dangerous errors, would be deceptive, hollow, and treacherous. The Church is struggling for its life, and must maintain the struggle until the perils threatening it are overcome.

"*Be gentle*," &c.—Such advice is duly appreciated. And if all the peculiar circumstances of the case are properly considered, it must be admitted that the *Monthly* has, for the most part, observed the rule.

"*Be faithful*," is as good and divine a maxim as that just noticed. And no considerations of personal interest, nor of policy, no private regards or individual tastes should tempt us to violate or disregard the claims of fidelity to the truth in the Lord.

The author of *Tract No 3* still delays the act of simple justice due to that letter of which he saw fit to withhold the larger portion—and that portion the most important for the author of the letter. This persistent refusal to do what common equity demands, admits of but one interpretation. What that is we need not say. The case speaks for itself.

As our readers will see in another interesting article on the subject in the present number, the matter has been engaging earnest attention in Waynesboro. Read the article.

## BOOK NOTICES.

*From W. F. Draper, Andover, Mass. A guide to reading the Hebrew text; for the use of beginners, by the Rev. W. H. Vibbert, M.A. Professor of Hebrew in the Berkeley Divinity School. 12mo. pp. 67. Price \$1.25.*

The aim of this work is to give the student all that is needful to enable him to read the text of the Old Testament, keeping rigorously to the plan of stating clearly and precisely everything that is essential to this purpose. This work is not a Hebrew Grammar, but it is a guide and a help to the reading of the text of the Hebrew Bible. One thing is given at a time, with exercises for practice, so that each point may be perfectly comprehended. It is hoped that the book is so constructed as to enable the learner to read the Hebrew text without the services of the living teacher. Nothing has been taken for granted on the part of the student. By a systematic and progressive plan of arrangement, which

he must follow closely and steadily, he is led on from section to section, until perfect familiarity with the forms and sounds of the characters and signs is acquired.

The book seems to be admirably suited to the important end for which it has been prepared, and merits a general trial.

*"Suggested emendations of the authorized English version of the Old Testament,"* by *Elias Riggs*, D.D., L.L. D., Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. at Constantinople.

As these proposed emendations are doubtless the result of long and careful study, no hasty judgment should be passed upon them, either of approval or of disapproval. Holding pretty decidedly to the conservative side on this whole subject of revision (as indeed on most others now in agitation), we feel the more reluctant to criticise this volume at present further than to say, that its author seems to proceed with greater caution and good taste in his work than many others in the same line. The suggestions are certainly entitled to calm and earnest consideration.

From *Claxton & Co.*, 628 Market street, Philadelphia.

*Historical Chart*, or History taught by the eye, by Prof. Robert A. Labberton. This chart, or rather these charts, are in large (imperial) quarto form, like an atlas, with distinctly colored tables, showing at a glance the rise, development, and fall of all the important nations, from the earliest times until the present day.

It forms vol. IV. of Prof. Labberton's History series, viz.: I. Outlines of History; II. Historical Questions; III. History Atlas; and IV. This Historical Chart. Of the first three we have already taken favorable notice, especially of the *Atlas*, which exhibits history in a Chronological series of 100 colored maps, illustrating, impressively, successive periods and stages of progress and decline. The *Chart* before us is, in our judgment, invaluable, and has received the warmest commendations of many experienced Teachers and competent critics.

Having spoken thus favorably of the series as a whole, and particularly of the *Atlas* and *Chart*, the author will permit us to point out, as calling for correction, what seems like an inconsistency, if not a glaring contradiction on p. 169 of vol. I.

After affirming that the Aryan tribe of the highest district of Central Asia was the true *ancestral* tribe of our *race*, whilst *we* are *Aryan* not Semitic; and that a deep sense of diversity has always severed, and still severs the two—the author asserts in the next paragraph:

1. That the civilization of the human race is due to the *two* great families of nations, the Semitic and the Aryan;
2. That both races once spoke the same language;
3. That the language and religion of the *Egyptians* retained vestiges to the last of the *original identity* of the Semitic and Aryan races; and,
4. That all historical nations are either Aryan or Semitic, *except* Egypt, the oldest of all.

No doubt these discrepancies will disappear in another edition. We wish,



also, that the assertion in regard to the origin of language, in an earlier paragraph on the same page, would be either wholly omitted or greatly modified. Even should it express some favorite speculation of the author, it is certainly out of place, according to his own definition of history. We desire to see so valuable a book as free from faults as possible.

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

*A Centennial Festival.* It was our privilege to spend Saturday, Sept. 19, with our esteemed young Brother, Rev. M. L. Fritsch, and participate in the solemnities of the Centennial Festival of his *Forest* congregation. The Church is located about 9 miles southeast from Reading, among the picturesque hills which abound in that vicinity. It was organized somewhat more than one hundred years ago, but owing to a loss of the records its earlier history cannot be definitely traced. On the occasion referred to the Church, an old substantial edifice built in 1814, was profusely decorated within and without, with wreaths, festoons, and flowers, as an expression of the grateful joy of the people. The property is owned jointly by Reformed and Lutherans, and both congregations, with their pastors, cordially united in the celebration. Although the day was inclement, we found a large assembly gathered for the afternoon service, which was conducted in the English language. On Sunday morning, the Rev. Bro. S. Schweitzer, of Union Station, Lancaster co., preached in German. We regretted that another engagement prevented our remaining for the service and becoming more generally acquainted with the members of this growing congregation. What we saw, however, convinced us that Bro. Fritsch is doing a good work in his charge, and held in deserved esteem by his people.

*Lebanon, Pa.* On Sept. 20 we were permitted to assist the Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D., Pastor of the First Reformed church, of Lebanon, in the morning in German, and in the evening in English. Notwithstanding the rain storm during the morning, the attendance was large, and the fairer weather of the evening secured a crowded house. The usual evidences of prosperity were manifest, and Brother Kremer may well feel encouraged in the prosecution of his work.

*Obituary.* By a regretted oversight, no notice of the death of our highly esteemed aged Brother in the Lord, the Rev. Jacob Dahlman, appeared in the September number of the Monthly.

After a lingering illness he departed this life on Saturday afternoon, Aug. 1, at the residence of his son, Rev. Jacob Dahlman, jr., 413 N. 38th st., Phila., in the 74th year of his age. Those who knew him need not be told that he

died, as he had long lived and labored, in the cheering faith and hope of the Gospel.

As the particulars of his life have been fully published, and no doubt seen by most of our readers, we will limit our notice to a few personal reminiscences and impressions.

Father Dahlman was a Christian, and a Christian minister of the Elberfeld-Krummacher school. His piety and theology were of the excellent kind which characterizes Krummacher's Elijah the Tishbite, and Elisha. By some it might be called pietism; but it was of a kind of which one might well wish the world and the Church had a great deal more than may commonly be found; such as is delineated in portions of Krummacher's Autobiography.

Both the piety and theology of Father Dahlman were of the decidedly evangelical Reformed, apostolic type. They rested not in forms and ceremonies, not in "divers workings," and outward ordinances, but in a living, personal, penitent faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and heart-fellowship with him. Father Dahlman belonged, earnestly, to that apostolic communion of saints which holds among its fundamental principles, that "the heart must be established in grace, not with meats."

It will be readily understood, therefore, how he came to be always found standing where he firmly stood, by the old faith and practice of the Reformed Church, and why he could never be moved a hands-breadth from that position. He was, in full harmony with this, a zealous, faithful preacher of that grace of God which bringeth salvation by the Gospel, the appointed power of God to that end. And he continued true to his "profession of faith, without wavering to the end."

For more than a year before his departure he resided in the vicinity of our Institution; and although other pressing duties prevented our seeing him as often as we desired, our interviews were always pleasant, and, for ourselves, most refreshing.

His labors on earth are ended, and we have the comfortable assurance that he has gone to the fruition of the rich rewards of grace in the mansions of the redeemed in heaven.

It must be borne in mind, that when errors find they cannot *force* their way by violence, it is their policy to put on very soft and winning ways. Pusey, in England, has insinuated his poison into the Anglican Church as tenderly as a mother gives pap to her babe. He could afford to do it so; could not well have done it otherwise.

But more of this at another time.

The call extended by the Reformed congregation of Lewisburg, Pa., to Rev. D. E. Klopp, of Trinity Reformed church, Philadelphia, has, after earnest consideration, been declined. To this Brother Klopp felt constrained by a due regard for the sentiments expressed in the following *preamble* and resolutions, as well as by his confidence in the ultimate success of the important interests with which he is now associated, and a deep conviction that he owes it to those interests not to vacate the charge at this time. Deeply as we sympathize with the Lewisburg congregation under the discouraging effect of this decision, it seems to us the only conclusion which could have been properly reached in the case.



Our former relations to the Trinity congregation make us continue to feel a tender concern for its welfare, and to cherish an anxious desire that it may soon be relieved of the pecuniary embarrassments by which it has been so sorely tried.

And now that Brother Klopp has resolved to persevere in his arduous work as its pastor, we trust that he and his faithful people will be cheered by such proofs of effective sympathy as they so richly merit and so greatly need. Let their appeals for aid receive prompt and liberal responses.

*Preamble and Resolutions.*

At a meeting of the Consistory of Trinity Reformed Church, held on Monday, September 14th, 1874, the following preambles and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

WHEREAS, Our pastor, the Rev. D. E. Klopp, has received a call from the Reformed Church at Lewisburg, Pa.; and

WHEREAS, Our confidence in and regard for him, as a faithful and earnest preacher and pastor, remain undiminished; and believing that if, as pastor and people, we cling firmly together in the efforts now making, the future of our church will be brighter than any of the past—and

WHEREAS, We are confident that our pastor's work here is not yet done, and that his going away at this time, would be detrimental, not only to the best interests of this congregation, but indirectly to those also of the whole English branch of the Reformed Church in Philadelphia. Therefore,

*Resolved*, That we, on our own, and on behalf of the congregation which we represent, beg him most earnestly not to accept the call of the church at Lewisburg.

*Resolved*, That should he decline the call, we pledge ourselves to stand by him and each other, and encourage him by our words and influence and ability in the work which we believe God has given him and us to do in this place.

*Resolved*, That we do not hold Brother Klopp in any way responsible for the financial difficulties in which as a congregation we are involved, but we believe he has always done all that could reasonably be expected of him.

*Resolved*, That these preambles and resolutions be handed to Brother Klopp and published in the church papers, and one or more of the city papers.

Attest: P. W. HOOVER,

*Secretary.*

ROBT. PATTERSON,

*President pro tem.*

*The New York Observer* says: "The boy Mortara, a Jewish child, who was surreptitiously baptized by the papists, and then withheld from his parents by the authorities of Rome on the ground of his being baptized a Christian, has appeared again, no longer a boy, but a Romish priest. He is now Father Pius Mortara, an Augustine monk in the monastery of Notre Dame de Beauchene, France, and on the 16th ult., he preached a sermon at Niort, in the department of the two Sevres, on the occasion of the festival of Notre Dame du Mont Carmel."

The year 5635 of the Hebrew calendar commenced on Saturday, the 12th inst., the first of the month Tishri, and continues until September 29, 1875.

The celebration of the new year commenced on Friday evening, at sundown, with religious services in the synagogues. Among the orthodox Israelites the celebration continues for two days, ending at sunset on the latter day. The reformed Jews, however, observe but one day (Saturday). During the festival no business is transacted, and the synagogues are open morning and evening. This festival is followed by the Day of Atonement, which occurs on the 21st inst., and which is observed as a day of fasting and prayer. The ten days from the commencement of the new year until the Day of Atonement are called the Penitential Days.

The Right Rev. John MacLean, the newly appointed Bishop of Saskatchewan, and family, arrived in London, Ont., lately, on his return to his diocese after an absence of 16 months. He has raised \$200,000 for the purpose of establishing his Diocesan Mission, \$150,000 of which is for the endowment of a Bishopric.

The first annual meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Mission in Japan was held at Yokohama in July, Superintendent Maclay presiding. Five missionaries were present. It was decided to ask for five more men—three to reinforce the Hakodadi, Yedo, and Nagasaki Missions, and two to open missions in Osaka and Kioto.

The Alaska *Herald* says that there are no Protestant Churches in that Territory, and that the people are anxious for missionaries to be sent to them and are quite ready to pay liberally for their support. The population is increasing, and the demand for religious privileges very pressing.

Rev. Mr. Ewing, United Presbyterian missionary in Egypt, recently used the cable telegraph to announce his own resignation and that of his fellow missionaries at Alexandria if their salaries were fixed at the lower rates proposed by the Board. The Board revoked its action in the salary question, but accepted Mr. Ewing's resignation.

The Rev. Theodore L. Cuyler, while in London, went to hear Mr. Spurgeon, and writes as follows of the great preacher:

"He just plants that broad, fat figure of his before the crowded thousands and opens his homely mouth, and a ceaseless stream of racy English, pure gospel truth, and trenchant appeal to the conscience pours out as steadily as water from Croton Reservoir. His 'notes' would not cover more than the back of an ordinary envelope. He never precomposes one sentence. But he has the whole Bible on the end of his tongue, and uses it with rare discretion and point. \* \* \* His versatility is wondrous. He superintends a church of 5,000 members, a theological school, an orphanage, and several other institutions, edits a newspaper, preaches three sermons a week, writes books of Biblical commentary, and publishes his own almanac.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—NOVEMBER, 1874.—No. 11.

---

“ACCESS UNTO THE FATHER,”

*As Viewed by Primitive Christians.*

It has been seen that primitive Christians had clear and decided views of the essential being of God, and how carefully they distinguished Him as the “Almighty Maker of heaven and earth,” from all the creatures of His power. He had so revealed Himself to their understandings, and so they believed in Him with their hearts. In the light of the revelation made to them, they saw enough of Him to know all they needed to know, or were able to apprehend, so as heartily to love Him, devoutly and intelligently to worship Him, and cheerfully to serve Him. In that same light they also saw enough to teach them what He was *not*, and thus to secure them against such false views of God, and of His relation to the world, as have always been taught by the vain philosophy of men claiming superior earthly wisdom, or as have been maintained by heathenish superstitions.

In full harmony with their divinely enlightened faith in regard to these points, it has likewise been seen what they held concerning the fellowship of God with His true people, and of His true people with Him, so far as concerns the *nature* of that fellowship. Especially have we learned, how they regarded it as most close and vital (in Jesus Christ), as a parental and filial fellowship; and yet as one which involved no fusion of the substance of God with the substance of their souls, no organic conjunction of the sub-

stance of God with them, or of theirs with Him.\* This was the main subject of our *last article*.

We are prepared, then, to follow up this interesting subject by considering some of the privileges or blessings believed by early Christians to flow from their "fellowship with the Father." These may be summed up in the Apostolic phrase: "*Access unto the Father.*"

Let it be noted at the outset, that it is "access to *the Father*," of which the phrase speaks. The approach made was unto *God*, but unto God in His gracious Fatherhood; that relation which He is pleased to sustain through Jesus Christ to each sincere believer. He is their Father for Christ's sake. They are His children by the Spirit of adoption. Through Christ, by the Spirit, they have access to Him. (Eph. 3: 18).

But it is Him, their Father-God, they seek; it is the Godhead they desire to approach. Whether they draw nigh for worship, with thanksgiving, or in prayer, it is before God as God, even in His Fatherhood, they would bow, and unto Him they would address their supplications.

This they had been *taught* to do by the Lord Jesus Christ and His immediate Apostles. "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven." "If ye being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?" "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you." "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." "Be careful for nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God," &c. "Whatsoever we ask we receive of Him (of God) because we keep His commandments."

To such devout and suppliant approaches to God they were encouraged by many cheering promises, and especially by the assurances given that one great purpose of the exaltation of Jesus and His session at the right hand of God, is, that He might there ever live to make intercession for us. In this respect the mediatorial office of Jesus, as maintained in heaven, is proclaimed as an encouragement to believers to go "boldly unto the throne of

---

\*The German *infidel*, Strauss, applied the term *godman* to every human being. If man's soul were an emanation from the substance of God, this would be correct. But it is not.



grace." They were assured that in Jesus the Father Himself loved them, and would welcome them in their approach to Him.

What this meant, and how it served the purpose of such assuring confidence, they could also learn from *examples* furnished.

When Peter and John, being released from their imprisonment, returned to their own company of believers and reported what had befallen them, the brethren "lifted up their voice unto God" in a prayer which gushed in devout praise and thanksgiving from their grateful hearts, in answer to which the Holy Ghost was poured out upon them all with fresh and reviving power. (Acts 4: 23-31).

Furthermore, they had inspired testimony to the fact that Cornelius the Gentile centurion, had received assurance that, even before his conversion to Christianity, his "prayers and alms had come up for a memorial before God." (Acts 10: 4).

They also had before them the case of Paul and Silas, in the dark dungeon in Philippi, so "praying and singing praises unto God at midnight," that in answer to their supplications a miracle was wrought which not only secured their liberation, but led to the conversion of the jailer and his entire household.

Upon this point, therefore, there was no room for any doubt or uncertainty in their minds. Great and glorious as God was, infinitely exalted above them in His being and attributes, they knew and were persuaded that they might in some true and real sense have access to Him. They knew, also, and firmly held, that to Him alone adoration and prayer should be made to the utter exclusion of everything like prayers to angels, or to saints, even though the latter had been prophets and apostles on earth. No regard or love they might have or cherish for such servants of the Lord, was allowed to tempt them to anything like acts of adoration toward them, or to put them in God's place as the hearer of prayer. Primitive Christians had too much piety and heavenly enlightenment to countenance idolatry, or anything approaching it. It was not until the Church had fallen into the degeneracy of the third, fourth, and later centuries, that men calling themselves Christians, and filling the places of Christian ministers, began to worship and pray to the Virgin Mary, and other departed saints, or such as were thought to be saints. And it was not until the gospel ministry was corrupted into a sacerdotal hierarchy, and councils or synods of such sacerdotalists arrogated

an arbitrary lordship over God's heritage, that such idolatry was sanctioned and commended.

*Nature of the Access.*

It must be preëminently *spiritual*; that is, in distinction from a bodily, outward, formal approach. Of course some corresponding bodily and formal act will be ordinarily connected with the approach; for in whatever our spirit may do, the body, as the tenement of the spirit, must usually take some part. But all such form or formality is reduced under the Gospel to the simplest measure. When the Apostles or other ministers of the Word preached, they had not first to provide themselves with a wardrobe of millinery, in which to appear decorously before waiting multitudes, and by which to excite in the crowds of anxious sinners gathering around them, admiration of their splendid apparel. When devout disciples wished to spend a season in prayer, they had not first to go to Gerizim or Jerusalem, but they kneeled down where they were, even though it might be on the sea-shore, (Acts 21 : 5) and there found "access unto the Father." They did not think that they must first get a book of prescribed prayers, and use them as written, whether suitable to their circumstances or not, but they prayed with the spirit and understanding, as prompted and enabled to do by the Spirit of grace and of supplication.

Such spiritual access was not looked upon by the Apostles and early Christians as a falsely spiritualistic, baldly pietistic way of approaching God. Judaizing priests and Pharisees might ridicule or denounce it as a flat, naked, indecorous way of praying; *they* might sarcastically stigmatize such prayers as "ranting expectorations." But true Christian suppliants were not to be defrauded out of their most precious privilege, or to be deprived of enjoying their holiest right, by any such sacerdotal or Pharisaic vituperation and scorn. They still prayed on in their own free, hearty way, and how often they did so with fervent, effectual supplications!

At the same time this spiritual access was most rational and real. It was not *mere* fancy or feeling; nothing *only* emotional, and in this sense simply a working up of private sentiment into flighty sentimental conceits. The access was unto the Father of Spirits, who in creating man in His own image had made him a *rational*, living *soul*, and who demanded of man the love of his whole *mind*, as man's most rational, or reasonable, service. Hence



the access must correspond in its nature and character with the nature of Him whom the suppliant approached. God was contemplated (looked unto) as He had revealed Himself, the mind or reason, and heart being devoutly directed in enlightened faith to Him, and to Him as *really being*, and as really "rewarding those diligently seeking Him" in this true, spiritual way.

2. Hence the access was *personal*, and this in the most literal, individual sense. It was an intensely personal act of the mind, the heart, the spirit of each separate person admitted to the sacred privilege. He approached God directly by and for himself. And he did it in words which expressed, and which were meant to express, his own inmost thoughts, convictions and longings. Some sentence from the Psalms or the Prophets might offer itself as the vehicle for uttering his prayer. But it was not used, excepting as thus suggested by a deep sense of what he desired to say.

His prayer was not a performance ; a thing to be said or done because it was decorous, simply, for persons professing piety, "to say their prayers" from time to time. Such praying is no true, personal act, in any genuine evangelical sense.

3. The access was *immediate* for each sincere suppliant. He went directly to God for himself. This is implied in what has been already said. It is a point, however, which needs to be very particularly emphasized in these days.

Sacerdotalism is beginning arrogantly to intrude itself, even in some portions of the Evangelical Protestant church, between God and His people. It is covertly and speciously reviving and teaching long since exploded Popish arguments in favor of a mediating earthly priesthood. Articles tending this way may occasionally be found in a religious paper claiming for itself special church authority, which only a few years back would have brought down upon it the severest censures of the Synod (in spite of what some that seem to be pillars might have said and done to avert such censure) for admitting articles so contrary to the sentiment of the Church, and so subversive of its faith. What a change can be wrought in a few years, especially when it is effected by guile, and in an unsuspecting Church !

Among primitive Christians this was not attempted, and would not have been tolerated. They had the Apostles with them. But even Peter, James and John never thought of thrusting themselves as official intercessors between God and His saints. In no epistle

or word of theirs can we find a single sentiment looking to such sacerdotal intervention in any form. On the contrary, we do find more than one admonition and encouragement bearing the other way. They cheered and urged the people to go, singly or socially, directly to the throne of grace for themselves, and to go "with humble boldness." They told them that *for each one* of them there was ever "access unto the most holy place" by the blood of Jesus. They encouraged them to dismiss all doubt, all hesitation in regard to their privilege in this respect, seeing that they had at the right hand of God a High Priest who "could be touched with a feeling of their infirmities," even "Jesus, the mediator of the better covenant."

Thus encouraged, primitive believers "*drew nigh* in full assurance of faith," and poured out their petitions directly into the ear of God.

To inculcate the opposite of this may magnify the earthly sacerdotalist's office. It may add to his personal importance, in the eyes of a deluded people. It may fill his purse and pamper his pride. But it does not honor God, or truly edify His people.

Other characteristics of this access unto God might be named, but the above are sufficient for our purpose. It will hardly be charged upon what has been said on the subject, that it is only *negative* and not *positive*.

Let the points presented be earnestly pondered. The views set forth are of course not in harmony with the principles of ritualism. But they are believed to be in full accordance with that Gospel which in Apostolic times was the bane of ritualism, and therefore a stone of stumbling and rock of offense to those who then vindicated ritualism.

Above all, let each one watch with jealous vigilance against all specious attempts to rob Christianity of this heavenly prerogative of direct personal *access to the Father*.

---

ARRANGEMENTS have been made for the permanent establishment in Lucerne, of an American chapel, upon the basis of the Evangelical Alliance. Its service will be open to the ministration of Evangelical clergymen of all deonminations, and free to all who may desire to attend them. Rev. G. W. Benjamin, M.A., of New Haven, Conn., chaplain, has charge.



THINGS TO BE REMEMBERED.

Not in malice. Not for the purpose of inflaming or fanning animosities against individuals, or a party. Not to keep up strife and contention, or to prevent the return of peace. There are other and far better reasons for remembering them. These reasons are supplied by the vital interests of our Church. And this, not of our Church denominationally considered, but considered as representing most important and essential evangelical principles.

The things which, for such reasons, should be remembered, relate to the attempts made for some years past to pervert the faith and practice of our Church, and to introduce in their stead doctrines and usages antagonistic to the historical life and character of the Church. They need to be kept constantly and distinctly in mind, in order that the people may know the dangers to which they are exposed, and intelligently, as well as earnestly, strive against them. Furthermore, they need to be so kept in mind, in order that none may be deceived by any present efforts to cover them up, and conceal those dangerous errors and movements, under specious disguises, and plausible attempts to make the errors seem not only harmless, but even the old evangelical doctrines in a new and better dress.

That they may be thus kept in remembrance, they are here set forth in a definite form, and partly, also, in chronological order.

Let it then be borne in mind :

1. That Mercersburg theology, or Nevinism, began its peculiar work by *undermining confidence in evangelical Protestantism in general*. Its aim, in this respect, was not understood, or even suspected by many of us, at first. By loud and earnest declarations that it only meant to purge evangelical Christianity of some of its faults, and by pressing its views in a very artful way, many were deceived. We were even led to sympathize with the leaders of the movement, and to think that they were often wronged by those who accused them from the first of teaching pernicious errors. A number of things said and done by them were calculated to keep up this deception for some time.

But as their movement progressed, it became more and more painfully evident, that its principal actors were by no means as

innocent of the things charged upon them as they claimed to be, and as many of us had been wishing and trying to think them.

Among the evils of their movement, this of unsettling, undermining faith in evangelical Protestantism, deserves to be named first. It was such, in a measure, in point of time ; and it seems to have been naturally selected as the first in the general scheme.

To cite specific proofs of this charge would be hardly practicable. For the undermining, unsettling process was involved in many longer or shorter articles published at different times in the *Mercersburg Review* and in the *Reformed Church Messenger*. Of course the whole of such articles could not be given. And if we should quote only a few sentences, it is very likely that Dr. J. W. Nevin would come out in a foot-note and try to trample them down as a "travesty" or as "garbled quotations," or that his facile friend, Dr. E. V. Gerhart, would issue another card on forged citations, &c.

But no one who has seen and read the articles referred to, will fail to remember, or hesitate to acknowledge, that they were calculated to produce the effect charged upon them. One illustration will suffice. Whoever was present at the Synod of Baltimore, 1857, will not forget the painful impression made by some remarks in the sermon of the Rev. S. N. Callender, bearing against the Reformation of the 16th century. And yet he only reiterated, virtually, what had often been said before by writers and speakers of the Mercersburg party.

Stronger, however, than any evidence of this kind, is the fact that so many of our ministers (all belonging to that same party) have since then forsaken Protestantism, and apostatized to Popery, or to high-church Episcopacy, which is the next thing to it.

Thus by its natural fruits and effects the nature and bad efficacy of this undermining process are demonstrated. Add to this the no less painful fact, that besides those who have actually renounced Protestantism, there are probably scores of ministers and members of our Church whose confidence in it is shaken, who do not love it as a faithful witness for pure apostolic evangelical Christianity, and it will not be hard to see how much harm Nevinism has done us in this respect.

Let this be borne in mind, and let the party chargeable with so grievous a wrong be held responsible for the evil.

2. Further let it be remembered, that this same party, or move-



ment, holds and maintains a doctrine of the nature and purpose of the incarnation of the Son of God, which is not only novel (in our Church) but directly at variance with the faith not only of the Reformed Church, but of evangelical Christianity in general. This error of the party was exposed in the *Monthly* for July, 1868, and recently again. It is not a mere harmless philosophical or theological speculation. If it were only that, it might be dismissed with a smile or a sneer, and left to float down into that sea of oblivion which has swallowed so many vain speculations of men who love to make a show of seeming wisdom. But this is an error which subverts the very foundation of Christianity, and necessarily leads on the one hand to pantheism, and (in connection with other views held) on the other hand to popery. And sad facts have proven, that however contrary these two effects may seem to be, they may readily result from the same error.

3. Let it be remembered, that to defend and fortify their errors, this party has boldly asserted that the Apostles' Creed (so-called) is virtually of higher authority for us than the Scriptures. For they affirm that the sense of the Bible must be determined by that of the organic structure (as they term it) of the Creed; and that not as it was understood, on superior Scripture authority, by our Reformed fathers, but as it was taken and explained by the fathers of the third or fourth century.

And in taking this false ground, they have concealed an important fact, of which no intelligent theologian can be ignorant, viz.: that the Creed, as we now have it, was not in existence, and of course was not known, in the third or even the fourth century, and that one of its articles, ("He descended into hell"), was not generally recognized by the Church until it had degenerated theologically and otherwise into the errors and growing darkness of the fifth and sixth centuries. Even Rome seems not to have held it until about that late period.

Concealing this fact, (of which it seems hardly possible that the teachers of Mercersburg Theology could have been ignorant), Nevinism has been specially zealous in trying to support its errors by deceptive appeals to the Apostles' Creed.

4. Let it be further remembered, that within but two years this erratic theology has developed so rapidly, and betrayed its true character so sadly, as to *assail the doctrine of the vicarious atoning death of Jesus Christ as the main or only ground and foundation of*

*our salvation.* Plainly and repeatedly as this doctrine is taught in the Scriptures, and accordingly set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism, the Professors of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster came out publicly in the *Reformed Church Messenger*, and pronounced it false. In the face of explicit declarations of the Catechism, based on cited Scripture proofs, and in the face of all that Ursinus, the author of the Catechism, and many others, say, setting forth and defending and explaining this precious essential doctrine of grace, those Professors have had the boldness to assert that the doctrine could not be taught, and was not meant to be taught in our standard. Because it is "a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offense" to their notion of the purpose of the Incarnation, above referred to, they reject the fundamental doctrine themselves, and teach others to do the same.

Since the exposure of this sad affair, and of its necessary consequence, attempts have been made to soften down the offense, and make it seem plausible. But the error still stands. The printed paper containing it is a record which cannot be ignored. Lancaster-Mercersburg theology denies the doctrine that the atoning, vicarious sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the cross, is the ground and foundation of our salvation. In denying this, it denies a fundamental article of the "faith once delivered to the saints," and consequently of the faith of the Reformed Church, which the teachers of that theology have solemnly pledged themselves to inculcate and defend.

(To be continued.)

---

#### DR. GERHART AND HIS CARD.

"ONE of the idiosyncracies of our common nature is, that we seem to have more consideration for man after he is dead than while he is alive." So writes a contributor to *Harper's Monthly* in a recent article. This article was either written before the death of the late Dr. Schneck, or the author does not read "*The Messenger*." The law of Moses forbid to curse the *deaf*, we suppose



because he was deprived of the ability to resent it and defend himself, and only one who had the spirit of a dastard could do it. A fair extension of this law in its application would forbid to assail the dead; but it was not so extended, for such a case was not supposed to be possible among the generous shepherds of that race and age. No enactment stands on any statute book in our age of unrestricted freedom, as it is by common consent deemed proper to allow all men for themselves to disclose to the world "what manner of spirit they are of." However, we did not propose to write an essay on the *heathen* adage—*nil nisi bona de mortuis*—yet our reason for thus introducing this article will discover itself more fully as we proceed with it. All the wide awake members of the "Reformed Church in the United States" have become more or less interested in a controversy carried forward in the *church papers*, growing out of an expanded card from the pen of Dr. Gerhart, Professor in the Reformed Seminary at Lancaster, Pennsylvania. We shall not reproduce this card in our pages, as it may easily be found in the columns of the *Reformed Church Messenger*, by those who have not seen it, in the number for May 6, 1874.

The *remote* occasion for "a card" may be found in a quotation made by Dr. Schneck, in his work on Mercersburg Theology, and found on page 119, and attributed to one of the Professors in Lancaster, and alleged to be taken from a publication known as "Tract No. 3," as follows, viz :

"All the benefits of Christ are received, *not by faith*, not through previous knowledge of our misery, not in the way of repentance and faith, but through baptism, and through baptism exclusively." And again : "There is no way in which a man can be created anew by the spirit, according to the established economy of salvation, but by baptism." And again : "A sinner may be penitent for his sins, but until he has received baptism, as God's act of remission to him, he has no true assurance of remission. And when after baptism he sins through infirmity, he cannot be sure of pardon till his absolution is spoken, signed and sealed by Christ, by the means of a Divine act through the Church."

It will be seen that the entire quotation is made up of *three* separate and distinct parts. Being interested, as it appears, in the matter, Dr. Gerhart addressed Dr. Schneck a letter, asking an

explanation and demanding the source from which was taken, especially the first member of this quotation. So much of Dr. S.'s reply is given in "a card," it is alleged, as relates to the matter. This is said to be his disclaimer, and the impression is made that his reply is given entire, excepting only an apology for delay and that it is all a disclaimer of designed wrong done by the quotation to the author of Tract No. 3.

Having given thus much, and we suppose all that is needful about the origin and contents of "a card," we propose to examine the matter in detail, premising, however, that it is no part of our plan in this paper to discuss the Theological differences that hold in the case, but only to look at it as a transaction involving a point in morals, in honesty, and respect for the memory of the dead.

1. With ostentatious charity "a card" exonerates Dr. S. from all intentional wrong to the author of Tract No. 3, viz.: "Only I wish it to be distinctly understood, that I believe that Dr. Schneck supposed the quotations to be all literally correct, when he inserted them in his book."

All this is very proper, to be sure, and even generous, coming from one alleged to be so grievously wronged. Apparently it seems just the nice thing and all that could be demanded in such case.

2. The question is, however, at this point interposed—was any real wrong done to Dr. G. by making the entire quotation to be taken from Tract No. 3? The writer of "a card" complains that there was, that on the part of Dr. S. it was unintentional, but on the part of some one unnamed it was designed and wrong. It is, however, admitted that the second member of the quotation is correctly taken from *the Tract*, and is in Dr. G.'s words. The third and last member of the quotation, it is further admitted, is correctly taken from an article of the late Dr. Harbaugh, also a Theological Professor, in the *Mercersburg Review*, and published with the full sanction and approbation of the editor of that Review. Thus far no wrong has been done intentionally or unintentionally, either by Dr. S. or the unnamed one. But of the first member of the quotation the writer of "a card" asserts: "Those words are not in *the Tract*—that it *is false both as to matter and form.*" "Nor do I hold or teach such doctrine," etc. We invite the careful attention of our readers—those who have not prejudged this case, to institute a careful comparison between the first and second members of the quotation, both as



to "matter and form," There is no need for any Theological finesse—apply the simplest rules of interpretation and how much of difference in meaning can be discovered. To a plain reader both declare that "men are created anew" in "receiving Christ" by *baptism*. As for the matter it is the same, and their form does not show the teaching either to be different or "the contradictory opposite." But we will yet call in No. 3 for its own testing. Among much of the same import Tract No. 3 says :

"The sacrament of baptism is a means of divine grace whereby helpless sinners are made partakers of the salvation of Christ,"

\* \* \* \* \*

"It is the sacrament in which he (Christ) through His servant acting in His name receives those who, conceived and born in sin, are by nature under the power of the devil, into living communion with Himself, and makes them really the members of His mystical body, the church. *He thus translates them from the state of nature into the state of grace, delivering them from the curse of the law and making them children of God and joint heirs with Himself.*"

Let the reader compare these extracts with the first member—that *false* one, and say can any difference in matter or in import be discovered? The eyes that can do it must be keener than those we are blessed with. We do not wonder that the columns of "Theology and criticism" in the Messenger have been burdened of late with efforts to explain away the inconsistency of "a card" and "Tract No. 3," but it cannot avail, nor can it avail to say the quotation is false in its first member, when it substantially teaches what the second does, and is in harmony both as it regards "matter and form" with what is taught and written in No. 3. We repeat, that whether these quotations be or be not Orthodox Reformed doctrines, or whether Tract No. 3 be Lutheran, Romish or pure Reformed teaching, we do not discuss now, and only wish to determine whether "in matter or in form" the quotation of Dr. S. wrongs the author of Tract No. 3. We are willing that the reader shall determine this by the laws of grammar and common sense, and the verdict must be, that even if the quotation be defective in form and not found exactly with the identical collocation of words in No. 3, yet the matter is virtually the same—that what one teaches the other does, and that no critical finesse can make it aught else for the common understanding; and that when Dr. G. declared the first member of the quotation *false* "in

matter and form," he either used a very bold figure of speech or else had forgotten the form and matter of his teaching in No. 3. If then the first member does Dr. G. a wrong, so does the *second* one, and he must be wronged by the whole of his Tract. We then conclude that Dr. S. did not even do Dr. G. an *unintentional* wrong—that there was no room for Dr. G.'s charitable generosity.

3. But the allegation, notwithstanding all this admits of no denial, is persisted in that the quotation is "spurious." No such collocation of words as this first member of the quotation can be found in the whole of No. 3—they have not the identical "form." As a logician Dr. G. and his friends know that all this is only the trickery of controversialists who seek not truth but victory, and that it is unworthy those who would teach the Church what is the mind of the Spirit and would do right. When Dr. G. sat at the feet of the noble and lamented Dr. Rauch, had he come with so transparent a subterfuge he had been severely chided. To the honest man's understanding this will not avail, and all they care to know who read, is that they get the truth—the fact. They want to get the soul—the life—of the teaching of Tract No. 3, and do not worry about the form of the sentences or the exact position of the members of the sentences. All this attempt to raise a dust about this false and spurious quotation is a sign of distress, and shows more of being hard pressed than we have previously noted. It is too weak, too transparent a device to succeed with those who can read English and dare to think for themselves.

4. "A card" piously proceeds to declare, that "it is due to the memory of the Rev. Dr. Schneck, that this disclaimer and explanation be put on record;" while it is charged by Dr. Schneck's friends that serious and *intentional* wrong has been done to the memory of Dr. S. by the suppression of a part or parts of his reply to the note of inquiry from Dr. Gerhart, and material to the right understanding of Dr. S.'s position. It is so seldom, if ever, that occasion is given by cultivated and honorable men for such a charge, that the public mind was shocked when it was made. For the sake of "Auld lang syne," for the credit of the cloth, for the character of "the Reformed Church in the United States," for the honor of religion, we hoped and looked for an indignant denial of the allegation. We have watched and waited long in expectancy, but we, at least, have not seen it, and yet we weekly search through the labyrinths of



theology and criticism, as they are retailed from the pages of the *Messenger*. Even a professor in Lancaster cannot afford to fall back upon his dignity in such a case. Silence will not avail. Exalted position does not elevate above public criticism. "Duty to himself and to the church *he is* serving in the capacity of Professor of Theology," should "have obliged him to expose" the falsity of the charge. It needed but to send the original of Dr. S.'s reply to the office of the *Christian World* at Cincinnati, to be seen of all who might wish to examine it, and to have a full and correct copy given to the world through the *church* papers.

Respect for the memory of the honored dead forbids that any part important to the writer of that letter should have been withheld in this case. Were he among the living, he could vindicate himself. It is alleged that a copy of the letter to Dr. G. has been found—that in it are parts very essential to Dr. S. that they be known, but wholly suppressed by Dr. Gerhart. In these suppressed parts Dr. S., it is said, asserts boldly that Tract No. 3 contained all that is in the first member of the quotation—that no wrong is done the opinion and views of Dr. G. by the quotation. He further asserted a purpose, in another edition of his work, to give full and ample quotations from this notorious Tract to entirely sustain the position of his book. Did now, if this be so, the dead have a fair treatment at Dr. G.'s hands? No Christian man but must be deeply humiliated by such conduct of the living to the dead—of one educated man to another—of author toward author. This controversy has not been without its incidental results.

a. It has unearthed the author of Tract No. 3. What was only surmise or conjecture, is now avowed. If "the Reformed Church in the United States" will profit by it, she now *knows* that whatever the doctrine of this Tract may be, that it is taught by one of her Professors at Lancaster, to the students in her Seminary, and is avowed by him. The Church now may learn whether or not there is taught by her Professors a doctrine that vies with that of Pusey for its extreme character in regard to the sacrament of baptism. Indeed, judging from the title appropriated, Tract No. 3 has been intended to remind the intelligent reader of that famous series of tracts put forth by Pusey and his associates, and of which Tract No. 90 achieved such notoriety as showing the near and vital connection of Puseyism with Romanism. It may

now be learned whether the teaching of Dr. G. in Tract No. 3 in like manner shows the close inner relation of Nevinism to Romanism.

b. It is further evident that the unwary utterance of theological novelties, or rather revampings of cast-off heresies, was premature—that “the Reformed Church in the United States” is not yet prepared for the reception of crude errors. The last few months has witnessed a strange shrinking from consequences, and even Rome is abused. What labor, too, has not been given to modify views and to the disavowal of doctrines that had not lately been denied. The acrobats who perform every week in the columns of the *Messenger* for the amusement of its readers have done some rare hairsplitting—have shown the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee—made error appear as truth, and truth in the form of error—squirring to wriggle out of some fatal false position and make their followers believe that they did not mean what they said. All this is so apparent, that even the blind have seen it. There is a return even to the Evangelical nomenclature, and occasionally when you read an article, or paragraph of an article in the *Messenger*, so strangely does it read for the columns of Theology and criticism, that you turn over to see whether you have not a Protestant, Evangelical paper in your hands—to see if it be not the *Intelligencer* or the *Presbyterian*. The affected indignation expressed at the imaginary wrong done in the first member of the quotation, is evidence of this also; for Dr. Gerhart then and there takes occasion to re-set forth his views in just such language as was his wont when the pastor of the First Reformed Church in Cincinnati thirty years ago, before he began to follow Dr. Nevin’s will o’ the wisp of Ritualistic high-fallutin. Why so indignant at the asserted mis-quotation, if not from a wholesome dread of the Church of Christ in its members. A step too far in advance had been taken. The teachings of No. 3 were put too squarely, so the rebound is to pure Evangelicalism, for we, *Echt Reformirte* do not ask better Theology than: “All the benefits of Christ are received, that is, appropriated by us and thus made our own, *not by baptism*, not in the way of any sacramental transaction, but by personal faith, and by the exercise of personal faith exclusively.”

c. Further, it sets forth more fully the sad fact that the teachings and the studies of Lancaster vitiate the nobler instincts and lead men astray from rectitude. We need not point to the case of



those semi-popish converts still remaining in the Reformed ministry, but Dr. G.'s suppression, as alleged, of vital parts of Dr. S.'s reply, is proof of this fact. We knew the writer when we did not deem it possible he could have so failed in duty to one, whether living or dead, who stood in such familiar relation to him, or even to a stranger, and be so unjust to the memory of that good man. But so long has the mind of Dr. G. been wandering in the fogs of error—in attempting to dress error in the garb of truth,—in trying to make the good, honest people believe that the vagaries and superstitions of Nevinism were Reformed and scriptural truth, that his moral sense seems to be blunted, and he who in better days would have scorned the deed, now allows Dr. S.'s letter to appear garbled to a degree that makes the writer unjust to himself and faithless to his convictions of the truth.

Not this only, but whether with design or not, he has deceived the readers of "a card." The impression is made by its language that all of Dr. S.'s letter is given except an apology for delay. Did Dr. G. read his own card before he sent it to the printer. If so he could not fail to see its import. Can it be that it was his purpose to deceive and mislead all his readers? His failure to publish the letter entire indicates this. Are we compelled to see in this the morality of Lancaster, its sacred regard for truth, its sense of what is due the Church of Christ?

Lastly, this card, and the dust raised over it, is a ruse to divert the attention of the Church from the main issue, and break the force of Dr. Schneck's book, now that he is not here to defend its position. It does not avail. The result will disappoint the engineers of that nice little trick. The people have discovered it. They will see all, and "a card" only points to where more is to be found.

ULRIC.

---

#### JESUITS AND JESUITRY.

As is well known, the Jesuits are a society, or rather party, and *sect* in the Romish Church. Such sects have always, in greater or less number, been found in that Church. And they have

often differed and opposed each other more seriously and violently than what are frequently spoken of reproachfully as Protestant sects.

And yet Romanists, and some half Romish Protestants, try to make the impression that sects are to be found only in the Protestant Church. Because Romish orders or sects (like the Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, &c., &c., &c.,) whatever their errors, and their bitter hostility to each other, all bow to the Pope, and hold to the gross heresies and idolatrous practices of the Romish Church, they are not called sects, or denounced as such, but regarded as in good standing. In regard to Jesus Christ and His Gospel, and all the cardinal doctrines and evangelical usages of Christianity, they may be heretics of crimson stain; but because they remain loyal to the Pope, and his hierarchy, they are honored as faithful children.

Such are the spirit and law of false churchism, in all times, the world over. But "the Lord knoweth them that are His." And none others are His even though Popes may bless them.

The Jesuits are among the latest of these sects, having been established during the sixteenth century, and for the avowed purpose of helping the papacy against the Reformation. The order assumed the specious name of "The Society of Jesus." And yet in its spirit, rules and aims, it could not well be more unlike the Lord Jesus than it is, and more like him rather whom Jesus denounces as "a liar from the beginning." This may easily be proven, and from their own acknowledged standard writings.

It is, of course, not pleasant to expose their true character in this way. But it is necessary, for they are at this day so actively and deceitfully at work in Europe, and in this country, in trying to undermine and overthrow evangelical Protestantism, that every Protestant should know something definite and certain about them.

Possibly they may sometimes have been falsely, or by mistake, accused of things of which they were not literally guilty. It was not only wrong, but quite unnecessary to do this. For they have been guilty in fact of so many outrageously wicked things, that it is entirely needless to invent any.

Then it is impolitic also to charge them with any thing that can not be clearly proven; for they will, of course, make the most of such a mistake as a cover under which to shelter themselves



against true accusations, just as was done recently in regard to those quotation marks in Dr. Schneck's book against Mercersburg theology.

In the present brief notice of the Jesuits, the authorities will be given for every charge made against them, (and they are all Romish writers, and mostly Jesuits) so that whoever chooses, even including our former ministerial brother, the editor furnished to the *Catholic Standard* from the front rank of Mercersburg disciples, may verify what is said.

One of the best ways of learning to know the true character of the Jesuits is to study their code of morality. They are certainly no better than their avowed principles of action. The purpose and aim of the society has led them to give very full attention to this matter. Having set out with desperate intentions to do desperate work, they needed a moral (or rather immoral) training and a system of rules, which would keep their head steady, their heart strong, and their hand firm, in pursuing their nefarious designs.

Men who have let themselves be taught to think wrong right, if it will only help them to accomplish their schemes, are the most dangerous of all bad men. It is this which makes the Jesuits so much to be dreaded, as we shall now illustrate by a few examples.

The ruling general principle of Jesuit morality is the so-called *probabilism*. This means that in all cases of doubt, as to what a Jesuit may do or not do (or as to what he may allow or command others to do), he may take the opinion of a few eminent church teachers, or even of a single one, if he has some reputation. If he can show such authority, *he may do anything*, even though the opinion followed should in itself be false, provided he can thereby serve the cause he has espoused.\* But on almost every question of morality these Jesuit doctors advance different, and sometimes contrary, rules. Hence, in each particular case the Jesuit might follow the one who best suited him at the time. This variety and contrariety was, of course, of great advantage. It allows the Jesuit to change his tactics according to circumstances, and yet justify his course by appealing to this or that author. The great Jesuit doctor Escobar saw an amazing proof of Divine Providence

\*This view is maintained by most Jesuit writers or doctors, and may especially be found in *Laymann* Theol. mor. I. p. 9; *Escobar*, Lib. th. proœm., exam. 3; *Bresser*, De consc. III, 1.

in this pliancy of Romish morals, since *it makes the yoke of Christ so easy to wear*,\* seeing it may be shaped to suit the neck of the wearer.

In regard to *lying* and *murder*, the moral code of the Jesuits is exceedingly loose and easy. We first take *lying*.

After laying down some general rules, the doctors give the following illustrations of ways in which persons may tell lies.

If they are asked about something (as witnesses or otherwise) which they do not wish to tell, they may say: "I know nothing about it," adding, mentally, "that is publicly known, or that I wish to tell you."

If some one seeks absolution or the sacrament of a priest, threatening him with death or other harm should he refuse, the priest may outwardly comply, that is, seem to comply, but inwardly withhold the *intention*, and so make the whole thing void as a mere sham.

Before a court of justice, a guilty person may under oath deny his guilt, provided he adds, mentally, "I am not guilty of it as a *crime*."

A man may promise solemnly to do something, but if he had at the time no *intention* of doing it, he is excused.

He who swears before a court that he will tell all he knows about the case on trial, is not bound to tell that which he alone knows.†

In regard to *murder*, Jesuit authors teach such fearful maxims as the following:

If any person insult a monk or priest, they may kill him, according to Escobar (1, 3) and Less; and some Jesuits maintained that even a priest or monk might *anticipate* an insult, or a slander which they supposed some one intended to perpetrate against them, by assassinating him. This, they contend, would be only self-defence, and is applied to a specially supposed case which we forbear to name.

Again, a man caught in an infamous crime, may defend himself against the avenger of the crime, (for instance a grossly wronged husband) by killing him.

Jesuits also teach that a king who opposes the Romish religion

\*His words are: "Quia ex opinionum varietate jugum Christi suavita sustinatur."

†Each of these points may be found distinctly stated by Escobar III, 3, n. 48, and I, 3, n. 31; and Diana III, t. 5, 100, &c.



may be assassinated or poisoned by any of his subjects, and that the assassin or murderer renders himself meritorious in the eyes of God and man, and wins immortal renown.

Such horrible maxims and judgments may be found scattered through the works of some of the most renowned and honored moral writers of "*the Society of Jesus!*" They are cited fairly and truly from their own works, and cannot be denounced as slanderous, by any upright, honest criticism.

And such is the morality of the men who now rule the Romish Church! These are the men whose influence swayed the last Romish Council, and forced through the Council the decree of infallibility! They are the men who, justly expelled from the Prussian empire, under reproach in Austria, hated in Spain, and spurned in Italy, meet Protestant ministers and theological students almost at the gates of American seminaries, where they have been prepared by false teachings for apostasy, and help them across the campus to the Romish Church!

What Jesuitry is, must be reserved for future consideration.

But in corroboration of the preceding outlines of Jesuit morality, and of the opinion entertained of them by one who knows them well, the following statements by Dr. Dollinger are appended:

*Dr. Dollinger on the Jesuits.*

In a recent lecture at Munich on the Jesuits, Dollinger observed that the experience of the last three centuries has shown that, notwithstanding their activity and perseverance, the followers of Loyola have never succeeded in establishing anything on a permanent basis. They are like the Turks, of whom it is said that no grass grows where they have set foot. Their missions in Japan, in Paraguay, and among the savage races of North America, long ago disappeared and left no trace behind. In Abyssinia (1625) they nearly obtained the supreme power, but nine years afterwards their missions collapsed, and they have not shown themselves in the country since. Of their toilsome labors in the Levant, in the Greek Islands, in Persia, in the Crimea, and Egypt, nothing is left but a faint historical tradition. To Spain, its mother country, the society of Jesus has always devoted its best services. Being themselves descendants of the Spanish race and animated with its national spirit, the Jesuits have for sixty years labored

for the extension and consolidation of the Spanish monarchy in Europe. What was the result? Spain became depopulated and bankrupt; she lost one province after another, and to use the words of one of her own historians, at the end of the seventeenth century this once mighty State became an insensible corpse—the skeleton of a giant. Their influence on the internal affairs of Spain was equally prejudicial. For two hundred years they and the Inquisition impressed their doctrines on the national life of the country, and the consequence was that all the higher branches of education were suppressed, that science was mutilated and distorted, and that to this day Spain is the most backward country in Europe, except Turkey. When the order was abolished, a Spanish diplomatist, at Rome, truly observed that “the Jesuits are to us Spaniards a worm that gnaws into our entrails.” In Germany (pursued Dr. Dollinger) they brought on the disastrous thirty years’ war, and they kept back the intellectual development of the Catholic States. It was they who completely undermined the old German Catholic Empire and prepared its fall. As the all-powerful counselors of the Hapsburgs, they are responsible for the destruction of the liberties of the estates, the introduction of absolutism, and the persecution and expulsion of the Protestants—that seed of unextinguishable hatred which the house of Hapsburg sowed in Protestant Germany, and which brought about first the spiritual, and afterwards the political exclusion of Austria from the Fatherland. In Bohemia, which was long under the special protection of the Order of Jesus, they destroyed the old Czechish literature, they were the cause of endless executions, banishments and confiscations among the nobility, and of the expulsion of nearly 30,000 families; and the present struggle between the Czechish and the German nationalities is originally traceable to their influence. In England the destinies of the Catholics have for a century been determined by the influence of the Jesuits at Rome, and by the hatred which they excited in the country, and we have seen what a weight of misery and persecution they brought on the shoulders of their unhappy co-religionists in that island. In Sweden the Jesuits attempted to reintroduce Catholicism by means of a liturgy which they had forced on the clergy, and with the assistance of King’s John and Sigismund, who were entirely devoted to them. The consequence was that Sigismund lost his throne, and they were expelled from the coun-



try. A little later they endeavored in Russia, through their instrument, the false Demetrius, to obtain political influence and the submission of the Empire and the people to the Holy See; but their proselyte Demetrius was killed, and they forced to leave Russia. In Poland they ruled for many years over the kings, the higher clergy, and the nobility; and Poland fell. In Portugal, in the sixteenth century, King Sebastian was entirely under their influence; they led him to undertake a foolish campaign in Africa, in which he lost his life and his army, and plunged Portugal into a precipice of disaster from which she has never been able entirely to recover herself. In France, the Jesuits were the conscience-keepers of the Bourbons, who drove France into immorality and infidelity; and they corrupted the French Church to such a degree that it was powerless against Voltarianism, and fell to pieces.

---

#### PUSEYISM.\*

THIS is the title of a revolutionary movement by which the Episcopal Church of England has been greatly disturbed for about forty years. As our readers have often heard and seen the name, they will probably be glad to know something about it. The following summary of its history, and of the doctrines and practices it advocates, has, therefore, been gathered from various sources.

Only let our readers bear in mind, as they peruse this brief account, that it is *Puseyism* we are describing, and not something else. If, as they read the facts and statements, they see a striking resemblance to something else, why that is a matter for them to settle with something else.

#### *The Title*

Of the movement is derived from a certain Dr. *Pusey*, a minister of the Episcopal Church, and a Professor at Oxford University, England. Of course, this man was under a solemn oath, both as a minister and professor in his church, honestly, faithfully, and earnestly to teach, maintain and defend its principles and doctrines.

\*Most of the facts set forth in this article are obtained from the article *Tractarianism*, in Herzog's Encyclopædia; Goode's Rule of Faith; McIlvaine's, Righteousness by Faith; Thomas Arnold's Introduction to his Sermons on The Christian Life, &c., &c., &c.

And if at any time his convictions should change, so that he could no longer subscribe to the faith and rules of the Episcopal Church, his duty was plain enough. In that case he should, like an honest, upright and honorable man, have respectfully resigned his place in the Episcopal Church, withdrawn from its ministry, and gone over to some church more to his mind.

But suppose he could not find such a church? Suppose that whilst the Episcopal Church did not go far enough for him, Popery went a little too far? What then? Why, then, better set up for himself and start a church to suit him. It is true this would have been schismatic, in a sense. But it is better to be an honest sectarist than a treacherous hypocrite. He had unfortunately gotten into a bad predicament, where his only choice was between one of two evils, and he ought to have taken the less dishonorable and mischievous of the two.

But Pusey was not so minded. He had another scheme. The Episcopal Church was already fully organized. It had influence, property, and literary institutions. And Pusey was shrewd enough to see that it was far easier to try to turn this machinery, all ready for use, to account for his purpose, than to attempt his work bare-handed, relying in faith upon the intrinsic merits of his cause. It seemed easier to pervert an old established church, so as to make it serve his purpose, than to build a new one. And this the more, because he soon found other ministers and professors of his church sharing his views and willing to join him.

Pusey was rather a smart man. He had from youth enjoyed the best educational advantages, and had never done anything but study and teach, in connection with some literary institution. Of course, if he had any talents at all, and any energy to improve them, he could not help acquiring some learning, and some corresponding literary and theological influence. His writings fail, indeed, to display any extraordinary profundity or ability, and are, for the most part, only a reproduction of old exploded Romish or semi-Romish doctrines, done up, generally, in a specious and deceptive form. If it were worth while, and some one should take the trouble to follow up what he has written to the sources whence he drew his matter, and then would subtract what was thus borrowed from what might be really his own views, but very little of Pusey would be found left.

Pusey appears to have been a man of a restive spirit. He



especially became dissatisfied with the earnest evangelical life revived in the Episcopal Church of England, and in vigorous operation about the time he entered public life. And he seems to have become inspired with the fanatical or ambitious idea that it was his mission to be a sort of Reformer of his church, by bringing it back professedly to the old faith and practice.

Although Pusey was not exactly the first to suggest the movement, he soon became its "head centre." As its most active promoter and writer, the movement properly took his name. This was the shortest and best way to designate it, and there was no wrong done by giving it this name. It is a peculiar movement in every respect, and Pusey is the chief advocate and representative of those peculiarities. There is, therefore, as much justice and propriety in calling it *Puseyism*, as there is in calling other movements after the names of their principal authors: as Pelagianism after Pelagius, Arianism after Arius, and Winebrennerism after John Winebrenner. When men in the church take the responsibility of starting new and revolutionary movements in a church, on the basis of their own notions, (or notions they have borrowed from others), they must be willing to have the thing called by their name as its proper title, and have no right to complain if this is done. *They* do so in other cases, and should expect to have the rule applied to themselves.

#### *Its Start.*

Puseyism took its rise as an ecclesiastical movement, at a revolutionary, independent, and rather private conference of some like-minded Episcopal ministers, held at Hadleigh, England, in July, 1833. What all was said and done by the kindred spirits, then and there convened, is best known to themselves. Such conclaves generally keep their choice secrets to themselves, and announce or publish only what suits them.

One thing, however, is known. It was determined at that meeting to use the pen as vigorously as possible in furtherance of their views, and to do this in a very cautious, plausible, popular way, so as most effectually to accomplish their object. Accordingly, they began to publish a series of *small tracts*, on such subjects as best suited their purpose. They were numbered 1, 2, 3, &c., and were issued in such quick succession, that in two years *seventy* of

them had been published, or nearly *four every month*. Of the topics and special character of these tracts, we shall have more to say by and by.

Besides working by means of these tracts, Pusey and his associates made diligent use of the opportunities and influence of their position as Professors in one of the principal literary and theological institutions of their church. There they could train and mould young men according to their own notions. Many of these were theological students. In the course of a few years quite a number of them would get out into the ministry, carrying their peculiar theology with them, and in their turn would mould and influence congregations, and so work on the public sentiment of the church at large. In this way, if the church allowed the Puseyites to go on unchecked in their crafty efforts, they would soon have the whole body under their control. It would only be a matter of time, as they well knew. All they asked, was to be left alone; that no opposition to their schemes should arise and disturb the peace of the church. They would only write, and teach, and preach, and pay very special attention to the children, so as to train them to the Puseyite ways, and so felt sure of ultimately gaining their point.

This was the scheme of the Puseyites. Any one can see that it was very shrewdly employed. They had, *first*, a leading school at hand; *second*, they turned the press to account (and for a time had even the press largely under their control); and *thirdly*, they got disciples of their views out into the field to work for them there. And all this while they had no need to trouble themselves about providing machinery. They used that of their church to run it down with.

#### *The Particular Occasion*

Of Puseyism deserves to be specially noted. There is something remarkable in it, as our readers may probably perceive when they learn it.

Toward the close of the last century, when the Episcopal church had sunk into a sort of stagnated ecclesiasticism, and become utterly secularized, Methodism arose, and penetrated the old church with a new vitality. This led to the formation of a party which became known by the name of *Evangelical*. "The aim of that party was to restore the spirit of the Gospel in place of a



dead letter, personal experimental piety, zeal for good works in place of a doleful orthodoxy." Wherever the influence of this party extended, the lethargy of the church was broken up, and a new, vigorous vitality manifested itself. Christian love and zeal, thus revived, sought out means and channels of beneficent activity. Various religious and philanthropic societies were organized for the spread of a true, living Christianity, in home and foreign lands, such as the British and Foreign Bible Society, London Tract Society, and Foreign Missionary Society. What the Episcopal Liturgy (Book of Common Prayer) and extreme Episcopal notions regarding the different orders of the ministry, and corresponding appliances of ecclesiasticism had wholly failed to do, and proven inadequate to do, was now, by God's blessing, being done through this Methodistically started evangelical element.

Very likely some human imperfections mingled with what thus plainly certified itself to be a work of God. Here and there evangelical zeal might run into somewhat fanatical extravagances. But to whatever extent this may have been the case, most good men thought that "a living dog was better than a dead lion," (such as the British Episcopal Church had been), and knew that it was easier to control exuberant vitality, than to resuscitate a corpse. And this correction of any extravagances which may have attended the evangelical revival, was sure to be made.

But there were those who viewed the revival in another light. It had exposed the weakness and worthlessness of a sacerdotal ecclesiasticism. It had proven that a church which magnifies a liturgy, rites and ceremonies, a formal sacramentarian Christianity, which makes the ministry a specific priesthood, must soon become spiritually inefficient, stiffly formal, and dead.

In this way the evangelical life by which the Episcopal Church of England was becoming more and more animated, was supplanting its previous sacerdotalism. The process was watched with painful anxiety and growing dislike by those in the church who clung to the semi-Popish views of the famous (negatively) *Laud*—still a considerable party in the church. For a time these Laudians were perplexed. By and by, however, after various private conferences and plottings, the Puseyite movement was started as an antidote and reaction to the evangelical life of the church. Other considerations had some influence. This, however, was the

main one, as the tenor of most of the Puseyite tracts abundantly shows.

It was not Methodism, its anxious bench and other extravagances, which were to be opposed. The great aim was to put down Gospel Christianity and restore a sacerdotal, sacramentistic Christianity in its place.

*(To be continued.)*

---

DR. DORNER ON THE AMERICAN CHURCHES.

DR. DORNER, on his return home from this country, delivered an address on the Evangelical Alliance, at an assembly of German theologians and others, at Berlin, in which he presented his impressions of American Christianity as received during his late visit. The Berlin correspondent of the *New York Tribune* furnished that paper with the following translation of his address. In its account of American Protestant Christianity, it will be found to present a pleasing contrast with much which has been written by our Lancaster Professors and their followers, upon the same subject. We have copied the address from our esteemed cotemporary, "*The Lutheran Observer*."

*Address of Dr. Dorner.*

The circumstance of many religious parties or sects in North America, their differences and their independence, as well from one another as from the state, have given occasion here in Germany to that perverted picture of church relations there which is often briefly expressed in the phrase "American peculiarities." By this is meant (1) that partition into religious factions between which we assume hostility and the jealousy of spirit which wastes itself in petty quarrels; (2) these sects are unable to found a church, to bring Christianity to a national existence, which ought to be aimed at even where there is no state church; (3) the state itself is a heathen one; because there is no national organization of the



church; and the masses wander in unbelief and are lost to Christianity.

These are in substance the views which are spread among us about the United States, and which are not corrected by our public journals, because they do not trouble themselves about such things, and have, moreover, no trustworthy sources of information. It is an agreeable duty, not only of gratitude toward American Christians, but of loyalty, to clear up publicly some of these errors. The measure of our relations cannot, of course, be applied to America; indeed, they are not so pure that they can be made an universal rule. We must try to understand America from herself and her history. I shall begin with the perversion and degradation of the masses in that "heathen" state.

There certainly are in America, especially in the great cities, great numbers who maintain no church relations; but the guilt lies chiefly on the immigrants—and not the Irish, for they obey their priests—but the Germans. The Germans trouble themselves very little during the first years, and attribute to the freedom of the New World the fact, that they are not obliged to have anything to do with the church. These can really not be driven to Christian morals and order. They are not left to themselves, however, but are worked upon by the several denominations, each in its own way. This begins even at Ward's Island, where the State of New York, at its own cost, provides physically and spiritually for the strangers—one of the noblest enterprises with which I am acquainted. Now the number of religious sects interferes in no wise with the success of this humane institution. On the contrary, their zeal is beneficial to the objects of their care. And in regard to the result, the American people have a wonderful power of assimilation. After an interval, these adopted citizens come again under the influence of religious sentiments, respond to the efforts of the sects, and adopt American religious manners—manners which are not ordained by law, but are rooted in the national life, though they are not always maintained without strife with the spirit of license brought by the immigrants. To these habits belong especially a regularity in attendance on divine service (*Kirchlichkeit*), and the observance of the Sabbath, which bring a holy and healthful rest to the busy and energetic Yankee. A populous district in this land cannot long want religious influences, for the different sects

seek so earnestly to give it the means of spiritual comfort. And thus the whole people distributes itself among the various denominations.

Although then the State will not make itself legally a Christian one, the settled character of the entire American population is something quite different from Paganism. Even a city like New York makes on Sunday, through the peace and quiet of the street, as well as the crowded churches, a very different impression from Berlin. Further, the principles of Christian morality in relation to marriage, slavery, obedience to law, order, are formally organized by the State; and the duty of educating youth is, in all States—though not formally, at least practically—adopted. The Mormons form only in appearance an exception. Their State is not yet admitted to the Union. One can learn in the United States that unity of church organization is not indispensable to a national or popular Christianity. But I go further, and maintain that it is the Evangelical Protestant form of Christianity which, for the most part, determines the character of the North American people. This Protestant character shows itself (1) in the deep study of the Bible in church and Sabbath-school; (2) in the *personal* character of American piety, since the Americans suffer themselves to become attached to one communion, not simply through family traditions, but quite as much through individual choice; (3) in the fine sense of family spirit, whereby the father exercises freely his pious functions; (4) the stress which is laid on the personal consciousness of the truth of Christianity. I add, that out of jealous interest for the freedom and independence of religion, the Americans look unfavorably on our church laws. As soon, however, as they learned that the State did not interfere with the inner organization of the church, but simply aimed to protect its own rights, they came over to our views, and even admitted that the growth of Jesuitism might compel them to take the same measures.

The schism and fracture there in church relations are not so great as we here think. In fact, the number of real denominations is not so very large. All have a trained clergy, and institutions for their training, as well as a tradition. Really, *they are not sects, but churches*, so much so that they regard one another as churches, and have little narrow sectarian spirit. American Protestants, English speaking, testify in their living



that behind that vanity of church organization and apart from doctrine, there is a substantial unity of faith and love which is not hidden, but revealed in many ways. The Evangelical Alliance was a striking proof of this feeling; indeed, it was possible only because this feeling existed.

In this regard the Germans were confronted by a remarkable fact. Formerly, it is well known, religious strifes and discussions were not wanting in America. Now all is different. While in Germany the differences between believers grow daily more bitter, and foreigners take up the quarrels, even if we try to stop them; in America the contrary is the case. Church parties are drawing nearer and nearer to one another. America began historically with many colonizing religious sects, which had their origin in Europe. But after these sects had spread out, they began to grow together in closer unity. The Presbyterian, a highly respectable sect, which was lately divided into the New and Old School, has just reunited.

Above all, however, it is gratifying to see with what respect, propriety, and reciprocal recognition the different sects conduct themselves, claiming and conceding freedom. The common gospel is so correctly distinguished from details, in which it is hopeless to expect union, that even foes of the church can learn what is substantial, what makes a Christian, and dare not say as here that even the theologians do not agree in their definition of a Christian.

This substantiated unity in the gospel has before the world this effect: It makes the Evangelical church a public force, since this unity and concord invite the world to the recognition of Christ. Without laws, without the aid of the worldly power, Christianity has there won for itself a power over souls. A proof is the respectful tone in which the American press speaks of religious matters. For the power of Christianity in the church circles themselves, let the extraordinary sacrifices which the laity make, testify. (The learned doctor here gave some details of church gifts and legacies in America.) The earnest, striving spirit of the American shows itself also in far-spreading zeal in the cause of science, and notably of theology. The German language is more and more learned in the colleges. German theology is much studied; our best books are there as well known as here. These learners will become teachers, and it is easy to foresee that in a

time not remote, an exchange of the products of study will be established between Germany and North America, which have already developed so many grounds for sympathy.

Out of the mixed peoples of America is growing a new, homogeneous race, full of fire and energy, full of youthful force and enterprise. Christianity has there conquered a new land. Columbus was encouraged by the hope that the new land would serve to the honor of our Redeemer. This is not accomplished in the sense for which Columbus hoped—through the conversion of heathen—but in a far higher sense. The discovery of America has not only a chronological, but also a philosophical connection with the Reformation; for, as it were, a new land arose from out the sea, to serve as a bulwark and a reserve for the Church of the Reformation.

The Americans feel already that they have a special mission, namely, to march in their fresh, earnest way into the fight against the skeptical and the superstitious, at the same time showing Christianity in a new light, as a living force, which needs no outward human aid in order to make itself respected, but which free spirits most need. Though I have tried to give faithfully some of my chief impressions, my opinion is in no sense that we ought, in church or theology, to abandon the system (national Christianity or popular church) which time and tradition have given us, or to exchange it for another. I have, however, felt it to be a duty to correct many current errors about the United States, and to point out some traits which we ought to copy, *e. g.*, sympathy of all Protestants, amity, mutual esteem, disregard for differences which do not concern the soul, in the place of peevish, narrow, uneasy strife and enmity. The present age demands new and greater tasks. Finally, may the free, open recognition of what is good in other sects, and the readiness for work and sacrifice for God's kingdom—the characteristics of American Christians—be our model. If we march hand in hand with America for these ends, the start which our history gives us in many respects will be preserved as a blessing for us and for the Evangelical Church of the entire globe.

---

WHEN the press is the echo of sages and reformers, it works well; when it is the echo of turbulent cynics, it merely feeds political excitement.—*Lamartine.*



## Arsinus College Repertory.

### LIBERAL EDUCATION.

#### A GRADUATING ORATION.

RELIGION and education are two of the most important questions that claim the consideration of every nation. The mind must be educated along with the improvement of the heart. The nature of the human mind remains the same from generation to generation, while the amount of knowledge varies from time to time. As the amount of knowledge differs, so the education from age to age must differ, in order that it may rightly use that knowledge. If this inconstancy in the amount of knowledge be admitted, then it becomes manifest that the means necessary in promoting the education of one age must also vary from that of another. Hence, it becomes the business of the practical teacher of any age to regulate and determine upon such studies as are specially requisite in promoting the education of that age. It is not so much a difference in studies as a difference in the spirit in which they may be pursued, that constitutes them liberal or illiberal. In view of this important fact, therefore, all the practical teachers of the present time should determine, as far as they are able from their experience, upon those studies which are best calculated to increase the advantages of a liberal education, and feel it an incumbent duty to furnish the rising generation with the most essential instruments of its furtherance.

The term liberal, as is readily perceived from the word itself, stands opposed to the term *servile*, to anything that is *not free*. Liberal education, therefore, claims for its object and aim to make men intellectually free, and not to be regarded as mere tools to accomplish some ulterior object or purpose. To promote such claim it must furnish that discipline which is best calculated to use, satisfactorily and safely, the amount of present existing

knowledge. In lieu of this much desired end, the rising generation must be educated in a manner that it may perform its duties as free, moral, intellectual beings. Neither could the advantages of a liberal education be better felt than at the present time in which so many doubtful, conflicting opinions and theories exist. Characterized, as the present age is, by such an unsettled, changing state of things, it becomes unquestionably necessary that a liberal spirit be cherished—a spirit that will give hearty utterance on the many varied topics of general interest. Shall the layman accept or be made to accept the priest's interpretation? Shall the invalid stand aloof from the science of medicine to let his physician alone determine the necessary cure, or most probably kill him *secundum artem*? Shall the client, as with a fear of treating within professional bounds, let the lawyer alone know the secret of extricating him from any temporary trouble in which he may be involved? Such an idea of education is wrong, and confines us to too narrow a sphere. The layman will no longer allow himself to be led blindfold by either priest, physician or lawyer. Thus it happens, then, that a knowledge of physiology, which may partially obviate the necessity of a physician; a knowledge of law, which would serve to prevent the increase of law-suits; a knowledge of theology, that might prevent the degrading spectacle of un-Christian quarrels and bigoted disputes, are more and more found to be the essential elements in *all* knowledge.

Liberal education, not so many years ago, was extended only to a few aristocratic families, to those ruling; but now the same privilege is afforded to the ruled, to all classes without distinction. Language, literature, science, and all they involve, become the necessary basis of elementary training, and whatever enters into the subsequent higher stages of knowledge finds its ground in this rudimentary process. Thus we find the field of intellectual action enlarging, the mind receiving a more liberal training, increasing its activity with more earnestness and zeal.

A deeper interest than formerly is now also felt with reference to the advancement and education of the female sex. The good accruing from the efforts so far successfully put forth, has been within the last few years most favorably experienced. Indeed, nothing stamps our boasted culture of the present with so much *illiberality* as the exclusion of the other sex from these privileges.



In noticing the development and growth of this liberal spirit, the benefits of a liberal training, we can not pass by unregarded one of the predominant features of our liberal culture—the advancement and progress of modern philological science. This study is gradually becoming a matter of chief concern, to which is attached great importance by all the practical teachers of the present time. The great necessity of a systematic and scientific arrangement and study of the English language, as one of the principal elements of a liberal education, is seen and felt by many. Safely may it be said, that in this language the world, before long, shall find its principal and foremost literature, and yet it has been wonderfully neglected in the liberal culture of our century. Nor does this work alone belong to the philologist, but to every student who claims to have any knowledge or appreciation of modern literature, or the necessary equipments of a liberal education. Not only do we make the study of English a study of language, but from it is derived that advantage of direct and immediate entrance to those higher regions of thought in which the higher discipline really lies. The study of our language must stand in the same relation to our modern liberal training as the classical tongues did to the scholars of the revival of learning.

Nor do we disregard the fact, that the study of other languages than our own is the useful and even necessary means for acquiring knowledge. In the language of other tongues reside elements of culture not to be found in our own, which well repay the student's labor and sacrifice to attain them. The utility of classical studies, of Latin and Greek, especially, has been forcibly controverted in this country; but notwithstanding all that has been spoken or written against them, conviction generally is in their favor. Many of the bitterest opposers to the study of these ancient literatures owe much of their educational success and scholarly attainments to the advantages derived from them in their rudimentary training. Despite all this, however, they would substitute in their stead a different and perhaps less disciplinary course of liberal education. No student who claims to be a lover of literature or who is not wholly indifferent to the refinement and taste they afford, can justly underrate the inestimable value of the classics. They certainly furnish abundant resources for general and historical knowledge, and more intellectual riches are amassed from their earnest study than is commonly adjudged to

them. The importance of the study of these ancient literatures, as one of the fundamental elements of a liberal education, rests on different grounds. They furnish us with that invigorating discipline essential to the mind in its higher intellectual pursuits, as well as the practical knowledge and mastery of our native language. It is out of the nutriment contained in these languages that the different other national languages have sprung, and in order that we may understand and rightly appreciate the import of a great number of words composing our language, we must trace them to their original signification and ascertain the ideas they then embodied. Besides their disciplinary value, they also lay open rich stores of ethical thought in works upon philosophy, history and art. It is believed, and strenuous efforts are putting forth to the accomplishment of this end in many colleges of the land, that scientific studies are to supersede the classics before long, making the study of the classics of secondary and subordinate, instead of primary and main importance, as heretofore. Even if this looked-for change be effected to some extent; whether culture in the form of modern languages and literature be introduced, we cannot ignore the special benefits of "the old grindstone theory," as some prefer to designate it. The study of the classics, even if somewhat discouraged by the introduction of scientific studies, should form one of the indispensable elements of a liberal education.

The utility of the study of modern physical science is more generally recognized than in our past schemes of education. Notwithstanding the attention which the English language and classics are receiving, the study of physical science is made to act a more important part than formerly in our general liberal culture. The study of modern science brings into exercise the highest faculties of man and calls into requisition both his powers of reasoning and observation. Knowledge of the sciences is necessary to the solution of the profoundest philosophical problems with which the mind in these generations is occupied. If the study of the sciences did not absorb the student's mental energies, nor prove solid, important and disciplinary, then indeed might we question the propriety of its introduction as an essential element in a liberal education, bearing in mind that the word education stands for a limited amount of time and a limited amount of mental energy. The highest education does not prohibit speculation,



but supplies the discipline that can alone safely wield it. Proper cultivation is necessary, for it is the absence of it which produces "that deluge of crude speculation and vague mysticism which pervades both the philosophical and religious literature of the day. It is not a knowledge, but a discipline; not science, but a scientific habit; not erudition, but scholarship that is required." Besides the disciplinary value and the development of material wealth which the study of modern science affords, we should not fail to recognize its importance as an indispensable complement to linguistic studies, and as a necessary factor in a system of education, whose place thus far has but in part been reluctantly allowed. We no longer believe the earth to be flat and stationary, the centre of the solar system and all other bodies to move around it, as the ancients did, but the many discoveries effected through science have utterly transformed our conceptions of the earth we inhabit, our history and our work upon it. It is by means of modern science that we are enabled to ascertain the laws which govern matter, and it is not until mind has the control of matter, a perfect understanding of the laws which govern it, that our life proves itself not a mere vagary, poor, and full of pain, but we are triumphantly led into the full enjoyments of intellectual life.

Another powerful and indispensable agent in the various stages of a liberal education is the study of mathematics. The study of mathematics, the key to scientific study, does not find its sole value to lie in mental exercise, for pursued as such it becomes distasteful and the most valueless of mental exercises. By many students the study of mathematics and classics also is regarded as barren, unfruitful labor, and these sciences are looked upon as mere mental treadmills, viewing simply their disciplinary functions. But to a thoughtful, considerate mind, there lies back of them something higher and deeper, which demands their earnest pursuit, just as in languages we found more to be hidden and reserved than mere discipline. The science of mathematics is *not* a dreamy speculation with numbers. Its beauty and life are only noticed when put in vital connection with those sciences of which they are the symbolic language. Viewed as the language of the laws which govern the world of matter, as the key to unlock its secret chambers never destined to be filled, they lose their distastefulness and become the necessary instrument to perform important disciplinary functions in a liberal education.

Another form of culture, æsthetics, in the form of art, performs an important part in a liberal education. Music, drawing and painting will receive more attention than formerly, since they are essential elements of a liberal education.

Briefly, then, the foundation stones of a liberal education are these: Studying the vernacular language in a systematic way, as well as ancient literatures on the one hand and modern science on the other. A more assiduous pursuit of these few indispensable studies will dispense with the obsolete schemes of liberal culture and completely transform our conception of true education. A truer philosophy of the nature of the human mind will thus be evolved, and the necessary process of rudimentary training be better determined. True education forever remains a discipline, and the studies promotive of this discipline must rather be of a nutritive than of a utilitarian character. Living, as we do, in a chaos of conflicting opinions, it becomes of utmost importance that men should be liberally educated, cherish a liberal spirit, and thus be all the more competent to contribute to a question upon which the vital interests of the future so much depend. Mind is speedily progressing, intellectual darkness is dispersing, the bonds of spiritual despotism are breaking, and the great truth is manifesting itself that true knowledge and pure religion invariably go together and find their common centre in God.

MILTON H. GROH.

---

#### COLLEGE MONOPOLIES.

QUITE a discussion has been started recently upon the question, *whether the multiplication of colleges is not operating injuriously to the cause of a higher education?* The President of Cornell University, N. Y., has shown special zeal in regard to the matter. He has taken a decided stand against the establishment of *so many colleges*, and pleads vigorously for such a combination and centralization of the educational forces and interests of the country, as would secure a few largely endowed, and correspondingly strong institutions.

Of course, the advocates of such college monopolies can write



very plausibly in favor of them. They can also exhibit what they sometimes are pleased to call feeble, one-horse colleges, in a depreciative, sarcastic style, so as to hold them up to ridicule. This may be a particularly pleasant way of treating the subject for gentlemen who happen to preside over institutions which have been so fortunate as to secure princely donations from wealthy and liberal patrons. Doubtless, it would be gratifying to such favored institutions if they could show their patrons that the liberality bestowed, was achieving correspondingly great results by drawing to them students by the five hundreds, from the whole country. If a liberally-minded millionaire has been induced to donate a million of dollars to a school, he naturally would like to see that school thronged by a thousand or two thousand students.

But, however pleasantly and plausibly the advocates of grand centralized universities or colleges may plead their cause, they have left out of view several important considerations. These, duly pondered, will be found, we think, greatly to abate the claims put forward in favor of such educational monopolies.

And, first of all, there is a primary point to be settled, which involves more difficulty than may be supposed. It is this: Who shall determine what the ruling character of the large, consolidated college shall be, and where it shall be located? To effect the object proposed, several so-called smaller institutions would have to be merged into the larger one. Each of these has its own history, special character, aim and work. Which shall be the monopolizer? Shall the weaker and smaller yield? But then a child or an infant might be buried, or swallowed up, in which are now lying, as yet undeveloped, latent energies and elements of power, which only need time and opportunity to mature into a measure of wholesome influence which the monopolizing school might never exert.

There are among the largest institutions in our country at this time, several, which, for many years after their establishment, dragged along in an exceedingly feeble and languishing way. Indeed, there were periods in their history when it seemed useless to attempt to sustain them, and when even warm friends despaired of their success, and felt inclined to abandon them. But they had a mission. The faith and zeal which founded them would not yield. And now they stand among the most efficient and influential institutions of the country. Had some Cornell Uni-

versity come along in the day of their seeming insignificance and weakness, and absorbed them, there is no probability that the consolidation would have at all secured what is now being accomplished by the revived and prosperous institution alone.

New York is a much larger State than either Connecticut, New Hampshire or Vermont. Would the district of country and inhabitants included in the four be better off if the smaller three were all absorbed by New York, and consolidated into one?

Jupiter is a much larger planet than either Mars, Venus, the Earth, or Mercury. Would the solar system be advantaged by having all fused into Jupiter?

Stewart does, we believe, by far the heaviest mercantile business in New York city. Would it be an advantage to that commercial metropolis if all the smaller tradesmen would sell out to Stewart? Or who should determine, and by what rule, who should be the absorber, and who the absorbed, in any such cases?

But there is another point of still greater moment. Most of our colleges have sprung up under the force of peculiar circumstances. This is especially true of some of those founded within, say the past ten or twenty years. There were special reasons for establishing them, reasons which were of sufficient force to prevail against a good deal of hesitation and reluctance to engage in the enterprise. Those reasons involved principles. To vindicate and maintain these, perhaps, it became necessary to start a new college as a means of defence and security. Possibly some older institution which had all along been enlisting the common interest and patronage of a large circle of friends, was abandoning the principles upon which it was based, and proving false to its original trust. The only remedy or help was for those who felt the wrong and feared the evil consequences, to unite in the establishment of another school, within the same geographical limits, and the same general community. They could not expect to start out on as large a scale as older institutions. But they had valid, strong reasons for engaging in the work. They are meeting a want. They are doing what needed to be done. In their comparatively restricted sphere, they are accomplishing more for the highest ends of a true education, in proportion to their opportunities, than is effected by schools which are filling a much larger space in the eye of the general public. Their effort is so far succeeding, that in a very brief space of time they nearly equal, even



in numerical strength, (a poor measure, by the way, of real usefulness,) the older institution. Shall they now be sacrificed to plausible outcries against the multiplication of so many small colleges?

Once more. This plea for large consolidated colleges proceeds upon the false assumption, that purely, rigidly literary or scientific ends, are the sole or chief ends to be contemplated and secured by our colleges. We join issue with the assumption as utterly erroneous, although we have neither time or space just now to discuss the point.

A word in conclusion regarding the objection urged against *sectarian* colleges. This objection is about as just and honest as those often urged against creeds and confessions by new sects seeking popularity with the masses who have no particular faith. What, in the fairest view of the case, is a sectarian or denominational college? Evidently, one founded upon certain distinctive moral and religious principles. Every college should rest upon some such principles. And every college founded by earnest, intelligent men, has such a basis. Has Cornell University none? If not, it rests on a very loose, sandy foundation; and though most munificently endowed, and magnificently equipped, will have a brief existence, and soon tumble down. But it will hardly be pretended that it has been so carelessly reared. If not, then what is it but a sectarian school, only after its own creed; which is—what?

---

#### HOW WE LEARN.

BY HORATIUS BONAR.

GREAT truths are dearly bought. The common truth,  
Such as men give and take from day to day,  
Comes in the common walk of easy life,  
Blown by the careless wind across our way.

Bought in the market, at the current price,  
Bred of the smile, the jest, perchance the bowl;  
It tells no tale of daring or of worth,  
Nor pierces even the surface of a soul.

Great truths are greatly won, not found by chance,  
Nor wafted on the breath of summer-dream;

But grasped in the great struggles of the soul,  
Hard-buffeting with adverse wind and stream.

Not in the general mart, 'mid corn and wine ;  
Not in the merchandise of gold and gems ;  
Not in the world's gay hall of midnight mirth ;  
Not 'mid the blaze of regal diadems ;

But in the day of conflict, fear and grief,  
When the strong hand of God, put forth in might,  
Plows up the subsoil of the stagnant heart,  
And brings the imprisoned truth-seed to the light.

Wrung from the troubled spirit, in hard hours  
Of weakness, solitude, perchance of pain,  
Truth springs like harvest from the well-plowed field,  
And the soul feels it has not wept in vain.

---

## VARIETIES.

### SCIENTIFIC, LITERARY, &c.

At a meeting of the Connecticut Academy of Sciences last winter, Prof. Verrill presented a paper on the changes in the climate of New England, in which attempts were made to show that at one time the fauna of the coast of Maine was of a much more southern character than at present, identical, indeed, with that which prevails on the south side of Cape Cod. The conclusions which he reaches are, first, that in the post-glacial period the coast was at a lower level, and the water temperature of Casco Bay in Maine was colder than at present, probably much like that of Newfoundland and Labrador in modern times. Second, that at a subsequent period, when the coast was nearly or quite at its present level, the marine temperature was considerably higher than at present. Third, that the temperature of these waters has gradually declined, but was still somewhat higher at the period when the shell heaps were formed than it is now.

Prof. Brewer read a paper on the origin of the name Rocky Mountains, the first approach to this name being found in Bellion's Map of North America, published in Charlevoix's History of New France, in 1743, where they are called *Montagnes des Pierres*



*Brillants.* The name of Rocky Mountains first appears on a Map in Morse's American Geography, dated 1794; while in the text of that of 1789 they are still called the Shining Mountains. The name, however, seems to have been firmly established in the time of Lewis and Clarke.

*The Hardness of Minerals and Metals.*—In physics, one body is said to be harder than another when it is capable of scratching the specimen with which it is compared. In mineralogy, in which science the hardness is an important characteristic, ten bodies are usually taken as points of comparison—the softest being termed 1 and the hardest 10: These are: 1, talc; 2, gypsum; 3, carbonate of lime; 4, fluor spar; 5, phosphate of lime; 6, felspar; 7, quartz; 9, topaz, 8, corundum; 10, diamond. Hence, when scientific works speak of the hardness of a body being 6, 8, 4, etc., reference is made to the relative hardness expressed by the list above given.

The tenacity of metals is estimated by the resistance which wires of the same diameter experience when passed at equal temperature through the same hole of a draw bench. The following table gives the relative tenacity of various metals and alloys: Steel already drawn, 100; iron already drawn, 88; brass already drawn 77; gold at 0.875, annealed, 73; steel annealed, 65; copper already drawn, 68; silver at 0.750, annealed, 58; silver at 0.875, 54; brass annealed 46; iron annealed, 42; platinum annealed, 38; copper annealed, 38; fine gold annealed, 37; fine silver annealed, 37; zinc, 34; tin, 11; lead, 4.

---

#### ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION.

“THE idea that poor teachers can give elementary instruction, that in the beginning, when children are young, the character of the instruction is less important, is a fatal mistake. The best teachers should initiate the studies, and guide the early development of children.

“Not by a superficial familiarity with many things, but by a thorough knowledge of a few things, does any one grow in mental strength and vigor. De Candolle told me that he could teach all he knew with a dozen plants. Unquestionably he could have

done it better perhaps with so few than with many, certainly for beginners. If a teacher does not require many specimens so they be well selected, neither should he seek for them far and wide. Let the pupils find in his daily walks the illustrations and repeated evidence of what he has heard in the school-room. I think there should be a little museum in every school-room, some dozen specimens of radiates, a few hundred shells, a hundred insects, with some crustacea and worms, a few fishes, birds and mammalia, enough to characterize every class in the animal kingdom. Pupils should be encouraged to find their own specimens, and taught to handle them. This training is of greater value and wider application than it may seem. Delicacy of manipulation, such as the higher kinds of investigation demand, requires the whole organization to be brought into harmony with the mental action. The whole nervous system must be in subordination to the intellectual purpose. Even the pulsation of the arteries must not disturb the steadiness of attitude and gaze of the investigator.

"The study of Nature is a mental struggle for the mastery of the external world. If we do not consider it in this light, we shall hardly succeed in the highest aims of the naturalist. It is truly a struggle of man for an intellectual assimilation of the thought of God."—*Prof. Agassiz.*

---

#### THE LAPLANDERS AND THE ARABS.

At first sight it would seem that no two countries had less in common than the two about which this book is written; but Count D'Alviella ingeniously and correctly shows, in his thoughtful preface, that they, or rather the Lapps and Arabs, have many circumstances in common. These two people "lead the same vagabond existence; they live exclusively upon their herds; they carry with them all they have and that they possess, and they make analogous migrations at the changes of the seasons—the Lapps from the Swedish steppes to the Norwegian valleys, the Arabs from the plains of Sahara to the pastures of Tell. In this manner of life they have both acquired the same strength of constitution, or rather the same power of resisting such fatigue, privations, and weather as would kill the most robust European.

. . . Both the Lapps and the Arabs—who are rather the



slaves than the masters of nature—owe their consciousness of isolation and powerlessness to the same superstitions, the same beliefs in spirits, to the 'evil eye,' in amulets, and in incantations.

Both races—restricted from centuries to a form of society unsuitable to any kind of progress—affect the same respect for the routine of their ancestors, and the same disdain for the arts of civilization." The author concludes rightly, we think, that both peoples, incapable as they are of transformation or civilization, are doomed to disappearance. Many attempts have been made by the Swedish and French Governments to get these nomads to settle down into civilized life, but invariably without success. The author, on the authority of M. Charles Martine, relates that the French Government gave to a number of the poorest Arabs of the Sahara some fertile fields with a ready built village, and even a mosque in the middle of it. They reserved the houses for their flocks, and pitched their tents in the streets; until one day the nostalgia of the desert seized upon them, and they returned rejoicing to their wandering life.—*Nature*.

---

#### PRECIOUS STONES.

AN interesting paper on the subject of precious stones appears in a recent number of the *St. Petersburg Gazette*. M. Gilson, the author, has just completed a journey round the world, undertaken for the express purpose of making enquiries into this branch of trade. From his researches it appears that, owing principally to the plentiful supply from the South Africa fields, diamonds are at a lower price than they have been for ten years past. Pearls and emeralds, on the other hand, are at a premium. At New York an opal about the size of a moderately-sized olive would fetch, at the present time, about 1,200 roubles, a sapphire of the same size would be worth 1,800 roubles, an emerald 10,000, a diamond 18,000, and a ruby 50,000. In Europe these prices would vary somewhat, opals and sapphires fetching more and emeralds less. Pearls are now brought from Central America, California, and the Persian Gulf, but they none of them rival those of the East Indies. The diamonds annually imported from South Africa into America are worth about seven million roubles, and the importation into Europe averages about the same. Many

of them are of good size, and nearly all without exception of a yellowish tinge, the consequence being that diamonds of similar color have actually gone down 75 per cent. in the market. Diamonds, indeed, would have fallen lower in value had it not been that the realization of enormous fortunes in America through petroleum and military contracts created an excessive demand. A similar depreciation in the price of diamonds was occasioned at the time of the discovery of the Brazilian diamond mines, Golconda having previously supplied the market. But the stones soon regained their original value, and it may be confidently expected that the effect of the African diggings will be also merely temporary.

---

#### A NEWLY DISCOVERED NATION.

The campaign of General Crook against the Apaches, last year, opened to research a tract of land, 200 miles square, which is rich in relics of our country's unknown past. It contains a chain of ancient cities in ruins and a coterie of ancient towns still inhabited by a race which prides itself on its descent from the ancient inhabitants of the country, and maintains a religion and a government both of which are peculiar to itself.

The largest settlement is in Mexico, about thirty miles south of the border line. It is a type of the rest. A strong wall surrounds it. Within are houses for about 4,000 people. The population has dwindled, however, to about 1,800. The place was mentioned by a Spanish Jesuit who published, in 1529, a description of his wanderings in America. About 1535, another Jesuit wrote a minute account of it. This account is true, in nearly every detail, to-day. The language resembles the Chinese. So an ardent archæologist, who visited the city a year ago, says. Some of the minor customs correspond to those of the Chinese. The women are of the Celestial type—almond eyes, protuberant bodies, little feet, &c. They dress their hair and themselves in Chinese fashion. Their religion is barbarously magnificent. Montezuma is their deity. His coming is looked for at sunrise each day. Immortality is part of their creed. The priests have heavily embroidered robes which have been used for unnumbered years. The ceremonies of worship are formal and pompous.



The morality of this strange people, as far at least as foreigners are concerned, is irreproachable. It is probable that they keep a record of events by means of tying peculiar knots in long cords. This, if true, seems to establish some kinship or remote acquaintance-ship between them and the Aztecs. Their government is a conservative republic. Power is vested in a council of thirteen caciques. Six of them are elected for life. Old men are chosen in order that their terms of office may not be inordinately long. The remaining seven are elected from time to time. One of them is the executive. Another is a sort of Vice-President. There is a War-Chief, a Chief of Police, etc. These seven caciques are usually young men. They serve but a few months. Suffrage is universal. It is scarcely necessary to supplement these facts with the statement, that these dwellers in towns are quite advanced in civilization. On this point one fact speaks volumes. Woman is not a beast of burden among them, as she is with all Indian tribes. She is held in high respect. Her tasks are confined to those of housekeeping.

The written records which we have mentioned, show that this isolated community has maintained its traditions unbroken for at least three and a half centuries. Its history, carefully studied, may prove a clue to the problem of the aboriginal American. The mound-builders of the North and the city-builders of the South may be represented in the town-dwellers of New Mexico and Arizona.

---

SPECIAL ITEMS.

*Twenty-eight* of the young men now connected with our college have the ministry in view. We have, however, been unable thus far to meet many applications made to supply vacant charges. Let our brethren bear this in mind, and endeavor, by proper means, to induce earnest, faithful, and competent young Christians to devote themselves to the blessed work. As the church wakes up more and more to the actual state of things, the demands upon us for help will doubtless increase. The people of the Reformed church desire pastors and preachers who are firmly rooted in our evangelical faith, and who are trained to preach and maintain it.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.—Received for educational aid (Beneficiaries) from :

Rev. E. J. Fogel, Jordan charge.....	\$100 00
Rev. A. Spangler, New Oxford charge.....	50 00
Daniel Snyder, Easton, Pa.....	15 00
Rev. A. Wanner, York, Pa.....	24 63
Rev. A. H. Leiss, Bermudian.....	16 70
Rev. M. L. Fritsch, Berks county.....	15 50
A friend in Philadelphia.....	126 38
Alexandria Reformed church, Huntingdon county.....	18 41

*For Home Missions.*

Rev. A. Spangler.....	\$ 23 00
-----------------------	----------

*Received by Rev. Dr. F. W. Kremer, for Missions, from :*

Rev. A. B. Shenkle, Millersville charge.....	\$ 36 00
--	----------

## EDITORS' DESK.

BUSINESS NOTICES.—*As our friend Mr. Pearsol has not yet effected the necessary arrangements for assuming the financial care of the Monthly, subscribers will please remit their dues directly to us.*

*All in arrears are again urged to forward the amount due at once. Let no further appeal be necessary.* Having now a POSTAL ORDER OFFICE in our immediate vicinity (Collegeville P. O.), money in small sums can be most safely and conveniently sent in that way. Address—

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery co., Pa.

*The Reformed Church Monthly for 1875.*—Taking lessons from the exemplary zeal of other publications, we solicit our friends to make suitable efforts for increasing the circulation of the MONTHLY, and so enlarging its sphere of usefulness. Now is a good time to put forth efforts for this purpose, so that it may start its eighth year with January, 1875, encouraged by the results of such efforts.

If all who have assured us of their warm approval of its principles, aims and course, and have appreciated the service it has rendered to the cause it advocates, will lay hold of the matter, it would be easy to secure one thousand additional subscribers.



To stimulate them, if needful, to make the attempt, we offer the following special terms, for the next three months: We will furnish new subscribers—

6 copies for 1875, (exclusive of postage,) for.....\$10 00

12	"	"	"	.....	19 00
----	---	---	---	-------	-------

20    "    "    "    ..... 30 00

and all above 20 copies on the same terms. Those who subscribe now will receive the November and December numbers gratuitously.

The MONTHLY does not pretend to take the place of *The Christian World*, our weekly religious paper. But in the main they work hand in hand, each meeting a want in its own way. The MONTHLY furnishes articles of permanent value, and can be easily preserved for future reference.

*Back numbers and volumes* can be furnished. Single numbers (postage prepaid) 20 cents. Back volumes (postage prepaid) \$2.00.

### REASONS FOR TAKING IT.

It is a monthly periodical of 56 pages, making a volume of 672 pages a year, which can be easily preserved and bound at the end of the year.


*Its great object* is to set forth, maintain and defend the long settled faith and practice of the Reformed church, the principles and doctrines of the church, and to do this in opposition to all efforts made to change both and to introduce high-church, sacerdotal, ritualistic and Romanizing errors.

*In its matter and style* it may be called a practical, popular review, calculated to instruct the reader upon subjects of vital importance, to strengthen them in the faith, and to warn and fortify them against deceitful and misleading errors.

Every member of the Reformed church should take it. It supplies them with substantial and profitable articles, such as are not usually published in a weekly paper.

*It costs* but \$2 a year, and for that sum gives more original reading matter than any other religious monthly we know of.

Try it for one year, and, like nearly all others who have done so, and love the old faith more than attempted innovations, you will hardly give it up.

 By the new postage law, which will go into operation on January 1st, 1875, publishers must prepay on all matter sent to subscribers. Our friends will please, therefore, add 12 cents to the price of the *Monthly* to cover this extra item of expense. It will be a small thing for them, but the aggregate will be of account to us.

*Another Apostasy.*—A report has reached us that another apostasy to *Rome* has taken place in the Theological Seminary at Lancaster. This time the defection is said to be from the middle class, and consequently of a student who has been under Lancaster tuition for some time. The unfortunate victim in this case, again, is the son of a highly esteemed minister of our church, recently deceased; one who, whilst he himself remained steadfast in the faith, was so influenced by personal considerations that he would not believe the evidence of his own eyes as to the perverting tendency of Lancaster-Mercersburg theology.

For the present the name of the misguided young man (for whom on his father's, as well as his own account, we cherish only the kindest personal feelings,) is withheld, although the report of his apostasy has come in so direct a way, from parties who, above all, should know the fact, that there appears to be no doubt of its truth. But let us await further developments.

*That Challenge Ignored.*—Our lamented brother, *Rev. B. S. Schneek, D.D.*, a few months before his death, published a book, exposing the anti-Reformed and anti-Protestant character of the theology taught by Drs. J. W. Nevin, T. G. Apple, E. V. Gerhart, Professors in the institution at Lancaster, and others. He supported every charge made against them by full and fair quotations from their writings, only in one case making the insignificant mistake of putting quotation marks to a sentence ascribed to Dr. Gerhart, whilst the very sentence in just that order of words could not be found in Dr. G.'s tract, though the *sentiment* was taught in the tract in the strongest terms. There was open to the gentlemen so publicly arraigned for teaching such false and hurtful doctrines, the fair, manly way of decently criticising it, and frankly refuting its charges, if they could be refuted. The author of the book was a highly esteemed and most respectable gentleman and Christian minister. His book was written in a kind, courteous style. His earnest testimony was every way entitled to decent and respectful consideration. If the parties whose grievous errors were so plainly, though most civilly and kindly exposed, (and this only under the pressure of a strong sense of duty,) felt themselves able to meet its charges, the way to do so was open and plain.

But how has the case been dealt with? Why, *first* of all, the book was treated with contemptuous silence. Evidently it was hoped in this way to kill it. The parties accused, and their subservient organ, *The Messenger*, were afraid to notice the book, lest some who had been all along blindfolded and deceived, might in this way find out that such a book was published, be induced to buy and read it, and so have their eyes opened.

This plan was found to fail. The book was widely circulated, and was producing beneficial effects. *Next*, some of the more ardent disciples of the parties exposed, tried to prevent the sale of the book among their people by intimidating threats, and to injure the book by maligning it and its author.

But this, too, proved vain. Then followed another plan. The Professors tried to black-ball the book. After searching its pages through and through, Dr. Gerhart found, or was helped to find, one sentence quoted as from his fatal tract No. 3, which was not exactly a *literal* quotation. He laid hold of it, and tried to make the most of it by disingenuous craftiness. He denounced it as spurious, forged, &c., and endeavored to make people believe that he had been grossly wronged. How he could bring himself to do so, conscientiously, is for him to answer. But in his heart and policy he went too far by pronouncing the quotation "false in *matter* and in *form*." He published a *card* on the subject, in the *Messenger* and other papers. Thus he placed himself before the public in the unenviable attitude of denying the truth of what he himself had declared in his tract. His conduct in the matter has been exposed. Afterwards in trying



to defend himself he dropped the word "*matter*," and stuck only to the charge that the quotation was false in *form*. But the adroit evasion could not avail.

Then Dr. Nevin (J. W.) came out in that foot-note and emptied the phial of his wrath upon Dr. Schneck, by denouncing Dr. Schneck's book as a "miserable travesty," with "garbled quotations." He, Dr. J. W. Nevin, had done the like before, and no doubt calculated that his denunciation would be taken on the mere authority of his word, and be retailed by others, to the disadvantage of the book, if possible.

In both cases the effect of these ungentlemanly assaults has been the opposite of what was hoped and desired.

But to bring them squarely to the point, we challenged them to prove their cowardly accusations against the book. Then we offered a premium of five dollars for every "*garbled quotation*," or every fair proof that Dr. Schneck's book was a "*travesty*" of Mercersburg theology, on certain fair conditions. Two months have passed since our first challenge, and one month since the second.

No notice has been taken of either. Of course this admits of but two explanations:

1. It is meant as a contempt. But the gentlemen concerned might know by this time that in their plight all such affectation of contempt is unavailing.

2. It is hoped by silence to have the thing forgotten, or the church kept in ignorance. Here, too, they blunder ridiculously. It shall not be forgotten that they are trying to screen themselves behind accusations which they cannot defend.

Their silence is a concession of their inability to make good their case. This is the interpretation which all candid and reflecting persons put upon their conduct.

Unable to *show* that they have been misrepresented by Dr. Schneck's book, they are determined to evade the matter by mere denunciations of it. Time not far distant will convince them how egregiously they have miscalculated the temper of a Church too long abused by deceitful and destructive errors, insinuated by fraud, and propagated by guile.

*Meanwhile our challenge stands.* Let them accept it if they are honest and upright men.

*Quite in keeping* with the course of the Lancaster professors referred to above, is a recent attempt to neutralize the effect of a notice of the errors of Nevinism in the last number of the "*Methodist Quarterly*." That Quarterly, however, will hardly let itself be duped by Lancaster's disingenuous disclaimer. The editor has probably seen and read Tract No. 3 for himself; also that number of the *Mercersburg Review* in which Dr. Nevin pleads for a *tactical succession*, and that in which another writer teaches sacerdotal absolution (much in the same way as was done by G. in the *Messenger* some time back); and that article in which the writer said that Adam's soul was an *emanation from the substance of God*.

The Theological Faculty at Lancaster would no doubt be glad if Tract No.

3 could be sunk in a sea of oblivion, and if all their other notions and speculations they or their disciples have published at different times could be forgotten. But leaden as the tract is, it shall not be allowed to sink yet, and ugly as the notions referred to are, they must be held up to view a while longer.

*Our Church Paper* (Rev. Dr. Russell editor) has recently laid us under heavy obligations, by publishing an article, or what is presented as an article directly from our pen, with our own proper name set in full at its head. This was, indeed, a most unexpected honor, and took us so much by surprise that it required a second look to feel quite sure that there was no mistake. The editor forgot, indeed, to inform his readers, how he came by the article, and that it was taken from a sermon preached as our introductory in Philadelphia in 1854, just twenty years ago, and afterwards published. But this was an insignificant and perhaps unintentional oversight. Besides, by inserting the article without such prefatory, explanation, it had a fresh look, and might be read with livelier interest.

A compliment so utterly unexpected, and so spontaneously offered, naturally prompted to a perusal of the article in the hope of discovering, perchance, some laudable motives which may have induced the editor to confer a favor all the more extraordinary in remembrance of certain past incidents which there should have been no occasion for forgetting. It was not hard, of course, to find such motives in the tenor of the article itself, and especially with the light thrown upon the affair by a clause which he not only italicised, but CAPITALIZED. The motives may obviously have been the following:

1. The editor well knows that we have several times within his memory been rather malignantly charged with having radically changed our views in regard to essential points involved in the present attempt by Nevinism to undermine and subvert the faith and cultus of our Church. He knew, also, that the charges were substantially false. And yet, for sundry reasons which will readily suggest themselves, he could not well come out openly, over or under his own hand and name in our vindication.

So he did the next best thing; he very kindly publishes an article as from us, which clearly shows that twenty years ago we stood firmly and squarely by the old faith of our church, as we have been doing since, according to our ability, against all attempted innovations and infractions upon that faith.

For this we should certainly feel very thankful to the courteous and generous editor of "*Our Church Paper*."

2. Another motive may have been this: The editor of "*Our Church Paper*" knows equally well that we have been very bitterly assailed and denounced as "a disturber of the peace of the church," a "troubler in Israel," &c., &c. Now he seems to have been constrained by a full persuasion of our innocence of such crimes, "aggravated crimes," (have we quoted aright,) to publish this article. Hardly a better refutation of the charges could have been put in print. By clear implication it proves that not [those who are striving to defend the church, and loyally maintain her faith—but those who have invaded her with false and pernicious doctrines, and who are striving to destroy her faith, are the real disturbers of her peace.



Certainly it was very kind in "*Our Church Paper*" thus to volunteer so complete a vindication of our course and character. And we would be inexcusably callous and ungrateful not to appreciate such kindness.

2. The editor, furthermore, has probably been aware that we have been unjustly misrepresented with being more Presbyterian, or (in some latitudes where it suited better to say so) Methodistic in our predilections, than Reformed, in our genuine home sense. Knowing the charge to be maliciously false, he adopted this pleasant, quiet way of refuting it as is evidently done by the entire bearing and purport of the article as published.

Other motives, besides these, may doubtless have operated in the case. The statement of the above will suffice, however, to demonstrate our intelligent appreciation of the service rendered.

And now, as some slight return for the favor, we shall be most happy to permit the editor of "*Our Church Paper*" to copy entire, into his next issue, this acknowledgement of his kindness, and, if he prefers it, with our full name. We hope that no undue modesty will prevent his acceptance of this offer.

Furthermore, as he seems fond of fossils, we engage at our earliest leisure, to furnish him with one of a favorite author to which he will no doubt gladly give place in "*Our Church Paper*."

*Dr. E. V. Gerhart still refuses* to do the fair and honest thing of publishing the whole of Dr. Schneck's letter. The reason is obvious. He is afraid of the effect. It would be damaging, of course. But that is his own fault. He owes it as a Christian and a gentleman to Dr. Schneck and to others to publish the whole of that letter. Nay, more, and chiefly, he owes it to the cause of truth and the Reformed church. He cannot withhold the letter with impunity. We give him another month to think about it.

*It was our* intention to notice Prof. Fritschel's last deliverance on Nevinism; to direct the attention of the Lancaster faculty to some things in Ebrard's Dogmatics, and especially his practical theology, which it would be well for them to notice before they dismiss that author, and before we offer some views upon their quotations (!) from him; and to make some other items in this number. But want of space and time compel postponement.

## BOOK NOTICES.

From the *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, 1334 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.

*Christian Love*, as manifested in the heart and life. By *Jonathan Edwards*. Edited from the original manuscript, by Tyron Edwards, D. D. Sixth Amer. Ed.

From the first day of its publication this admirable treatise by one the ablest and most devout American theologians of the last century, has received the highest commendations of men eminently qualified to judge of its merits. One writes: "This new work from the great mind and heart of Edwards needs no word of commendation from me. \* \* How true to the high standard of the

Gospel! How full of the richest practical lessons! How affectionately severe to the reader's soul!" Another says: "I hardly know a book that has interested or profited me more."

By the liberality of a friend, the Board is enabled to furnish the volume (530 pp.) at \$1.25.

*Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, contains six valuable articles upon as many highly interesting and important subjects, fully maintaining its reputation as a theological quarterly. The following is the special advertisement for 1875:

The *Thirty-second* volume of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA will commence with the January number, 1875, under the editorship of Professors E. Park, of Andover, and George E. Day, of New Haven.

This standard Quarterly is devoted to able and elaborate discussions of questions in Theology, Biblical Literature, Church History, Philology, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Classical Learning, and holds a position in some respects not occupied by any other periodical in the country. Its articles are intended to be of permanent value, and specially suited to the wants of ministers of all denominations who value and seek to promote a thorough scholarship among the ministry. It is not sectarian, but admits articles from able writers among many different denominations.

A large number of valuable articles are already secured for the coming year. It is expected than the articles on the Plan and Structure of a Sermon, by Professor Park, which were necessarily suspended during the last year, will be resumed in 1875. Articles may also be expected from Drs. Hill, Thomson, and others.

TERMS.—\$4.00 per annum, payable *in advance*, and 12 cents for pre-payment of the postage. The new law which goes into effect on the first of January, 1875, requires the pre-payment of the postage on Quarterlies at the *Office of Publication*. The postage on this work will be 12 cents per annum, as heretofore, and that sum will be included in the bill sent with the January number.

N. B.—Those who remit \$4.00 before the first of January will receive their numbers for the year prepaid at the expense of the Publisher.

WARREN F. DRAPER, Publisher, Andover, Mass.

The *National Sunday-school Teacher*, M. C. Hazard, Editor, aided by an Editorial Committee representing five denominations, is an excellent publication, well suited to its purpose. Published at 147 Fifth Avenue, Chicago. Terms, \$1.50 a year.

The *Church Union* and *Christian Age* have been consolidated. This is a happy measure, one that is certain to increase the power of both. The paper is now a large quarto of 16 pages. It is well edited, based on evangelical principles, and specially devoted to the advocacy of Christian unity and Church union. Sometimes it may run its specialty too far. But in the main its spirit, style and aims, deserve commendation. Published at 50 Beekman street, New York. Terms, \$2.00 a year.

*Special attention* is directed to the advertisement of the *Pilger Buchhandlung*, Reading, Pa. It supplies orders at moderate charges.

Note the American Tract advertisement of *Christlieb's* work.

Also *Wanamaker & Brown's* new advertisement.



## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.—Rev. James A. Shultz, from Reading, Pa., to Minersville, Pa. Rev. Levi Rike, to Farmersville, O. Rev. H. Wegert, from New Bavaria, Henry Co., O., to Haskins, Wood co., O.

ADDITIONS TO CHURCHES.—Mt. Pleasant, Pa., 15, Rev. D. B. Lady, Pastor. Mt. Zion's Church, near Dayton, O., Rev. Dr. D. Winters, 4. New York, Rev. Emanuel Schultz, 7. West Lodi, O., Rev. W. B. Lander, 5. Shellsburg, Pa., Rev. W. D. Lefevre, 32. New Providence, Pa., Rev. J. Hannabery, 2. Fennel Reformed Church, Rev. S. Shaw, 10. Trinity Reformed Church, New Salem, 14. Kittanning, Pa., Rev. D. S. Dieffenbacher, 10. Rev. Dr. Helffrich, Long Swamp, Pa., 41, including 3 fathers and 3 mothers; Lynntown, 24; in two weeks in Lehigh Church, 28. Rev. E. J. Fogel, Jordan, 42; Morgantland, 20; Lowhill, 9.

DEDICATIONS.—At Hazleton, Pa., the New Reformed Emanuel Church was dedicated Sept. 20th. At Youngstown, Pa., the Emanuel church was dedicated September 20th.

THE *reopening* of the Reformed Church in Myerstown was celebrated with appropriate services on *Saturday and Sunday*, Oct. 10 and 11. Having been thoroughly renovated and beautified, the church is now one of the most attractive and comfortable in our connection, as it is also one of the largest. To other improvements, the reconstruction of the organ with additions to its power has been added, so that it now serves its important purpose admirably in the efficient hands of the performer, the daughter of the pastor.

The reopening services were largely attended throughout, proving the lively interest taken in them by the congregation and the community generally. They commenced on Saturday afternoon, when the Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D., of Lebanon, preached a forcible German sermon, followed by a very appropriate discourse in English by the Rev. H. Mosser, of Reading: Another service in English, was held in the evening, and three on Sunday, German in the morning, (when the building was filled to its utmost capacity) and English in the afternoon and evening. The sermons on Saturday evening, and Sunday morning and afternoon were allotted to us. On Sunday evening Prof. Reilly preached, as we have learned to a full house.

Both pastor, the Rev. G. Wolf, D.D., and people, have reason to raise a grateful Ebenezer at this point in the history of the congregation. Manifest tokens of divine favor are resting upon them, inciting them "to thank God and take courage." The improvements cost about \$3,000, and *are paid for*. Let the work of the Lord among them be prosecuted with renovated devotion and zeal.

ON Sunday evening, by previous appointment, it was our privilege to preach in Womelsdorf. It was cheering to find a large congregation assembled, and similar evidences of spiritual prosperity to those exhibited in Myerstown. This charge stands firmly and intelligently by the old Reformed faith. No ritualistic flummery needed to "make things lively." None is desired, and none

would be tolerated. At Womelsdorf we engaged the pleasant hospitality of our friend Dr. James Livergood and wife, and we were glad to find that the Dr. had pretty well recovered from his long and serious illness.

THE *Eastern Synod* of the Reformed Church held its annual sessions in Bethlehem, Pa. Rev. N. S. Strassburgh, of Allentown was chosen President. Besides the usual routine business, the discussion of Sunday-school topics enlisted considerable interest. The Synod must have been somewhat startled by the reported serious financial embarrassment of the Publication Board, or printing establishment. It seems that it is in arrears with the Treasurer about \$15,000. This, we presume, is apart from other heavy debts. We are not surprised that such a crisis has arrived. It is true the establishment has received donations from the Church which may be called large, considering the limited extent of its operations. It is also true that it has enjoyed a monopoly of the profits arising from the publication of the Hymn Book, Catechism, &c., &c. With such aid and advantages it should have been able to get along.

But then the *Messenger* and *Mercersburg Review* have been a heavy load to carry, costing for a number of years nearly or quite \$3,000 a year more than the receipts. In the case of the *Review*, at least, there is no excuse for burdening the Synod with such a load, and we have always protested against it as an unjust imposition. No other Church endures it. If the ritualistic party want such a Quarterly, let them support and pay for it, and not tax the Synod with the maintenance of such an exclusively party organ. "Authorized publications" seem to be a rather expensive ecclesiastical luxury.

THE *Potomac Synod* met in Hanover, Pa. A point of main general interest in its transactions was the adjudication of the appeal of a representative of the congregation in Frederick, involving the recent troubles there growing out of the arbitrary course of the consistory, in refusing to submit to the people the pastoral candidate desired by them. The attorney for the appellant, Rev. F. A. Rupley, of Middletown, Md., is said to have made a speech of great power, setting forth facts proving the arrogant pretensions and arbitrary measures of the high-church party, which opened many eyes, and produced a deep impression. Altogether the tactics by which a high-church university (no doubt under direction from headquarters) carried its scheme, temporarily, in Frederick, were most reprehensible. We have purposely kept silent regarding the matter, hitherto. But our readers may expect a full expose of the whole affair in the December Monthly. The appeal was not sustained by the Potomac Synod, of course not. But the matter is to be carried to the General Synod. This is right. The case involves principles of vital importance to the rights of the people. At the General Synod it will probably be dealt with according to right and truth.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.—The General Convention of the Episcopal church in the United States recently met in New York city. Two points of general interest received attention, both involving high-churchism. One was the case of Prof. Seymour, elected to succeed Dr. Whitehouse, deceased, as Bishop of Illinois. It seems Seymour was elected under false colors, not being known as an ultra high-churchman. Subsequently, some who voted for him, finding they had been deceived, sent in a protest against his being confirmed as a bishop by the General Convention. After a long and ardent contest he was defeated; but by the lay-vote, nine-tenths of the ministers and most of the bishops having voted for him. Thus the laymen saved the church. Let the fact be well noted.

The other point was the adoption of some amendments of the rules of the church against ritualism. This action, however, was so manipulated by the ritualists that it will hardly do any good, though it looks like a success for the evangelical party.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.—DECEMBER, 1874.—No. 12.

---

JESUS—EMMANUEL.

THESE two names—most precious names they are to every sincere Christian heart—are found in close connection, in the very first chapter of the New Testament. Each in itself is significant. Taken together, as they are placed together by the Holy Ghost, they declare the fundamental doctrine of redemption, as taught in the Gospel, and as devoutly held by *primitive Christians*.

For though they may seem to be but names used to designate the Messiah, they are really more than mere names, as men commonly bear names now. *They express facts and truths.* They reveal and stand for a reality fully corresponding with their import. Not only have they in themselves a meaning, as by a happy chance. They were employed because of their meaning, that they might be, as it were, the Gospel in two words.

So they were understood when the *Angel* and the *prophet* first used them. This purpose they were intended, by the Spirit, to serve. And so they were regarded by *primitive believers* when, after years had passed, Matthew\* was moved to write his Gospel.

In this view mark the circumstances under which the names are mentioned, and the peculiar manner in which they are connected and explained in Matthew 1: 21—23.

v. 21. "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name JESUS, for He shall save His people from their sins."

---

\*The Gospel according to *Matthew* was written about A. D. 60, consequently near the close of the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles, and after Christianity had made considerable progress. It sets forth, therefore, "*the faith*" as then prevailing in the Church.

v. 22. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying:

v. 23. Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."

It will be readily observed, that verse 21 is given as part of what the "angel of the Lord" said to Joseph. Then, in the next two verses the Evangelist, prompted by the Spirit, applies to the announcement of the angel a prophecy of Isaiah, as finding its proper fulfillment in Him whose near birth was thus announced to Joseph.

Taking the two things together, we learn that the *Jesus* named by the angel and the *Emmanuel* foretold by Isaiah (7: 14) were held to be identical. Furthermore it is clear that the *latter* name, Emmanuel, is to be understood in the sense of the former, Jesus. He would prove Himself Emmanuel by being Jesus; He would be Emmanuel that He might be Jesus. For it is expressly affirmed, as will be noted, that "*all this was done that it might be fulfilled* which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet."

Evidently, therefore, the two names, as here presented, stand thus related to each other by their significant application to Christ. The predicted Emmanuel of prophecy should be the Jesus of the Gospel, and should verify the purpose and import of the prediction by His person, office and work, as Jesus, that is, as the "*Saviour* of His people from their sins."

The annunciation of the angel to Mary, in Luke 1: 31, 35, fully confirms this view.

Now ask

*What primitive Christians believed*

regarding the import of this double name of Christ? Let them tell us what they learned from their apostolic teachers concerning the sense of the names as designating the character of His person and His work, and the reasons why He bore the name Jesus—Emmanuel. And let the answer be given strictly according to Gospel, as the great facts and truths of the Gospel are manifested and explained in and by the light of the entire life and work of Christ.

*First* of all then, by his name

*Jesus,*

they understood that the *fact* of the "*great salvation*" to be effected



by Him, was distinctly proclaimed, and that this should be chiefly a salvation "*from their sins.*" Many divine prophecies and promises, dating back to that first given in Paradise, after the fall of our first parents, had assured wretched man that such a salvation would be provided by God, and that it would be accomplished by a *personal* Redeemer. By those promises and prophecies man had been kept from utter despair, and the hope of deliverance from all the dreadful consequences of the fall had been awakened and kept alive in his heart.

Those to whom such cheering pledges of God's purpose of mercy were originally given may have failed, indeed, rightly to understand them. They, for the most part, misunderstood them, supposing that the salvation would be a temporal or an earthly redemption from social or national afflictions. Such misapprehensions, for a time, blinded the eyes and misled the minds even of the more immediate disciples of Jesus, after His advent. But all these mistakes had been corrected. And believers of the time to which this article, refers had learned to know well what *salvation by Jesus* really meant. *They* knew why He was called Jesus.

To their opened eyes, all that Moses and the prophets had spoken of Him, appeared in a new spiritual light, and testified to their need of a far more amazing and desirable redemption than might be secured by deliverance from political thralldom, or from merely temporal woes. They also saw in a clearer, purer light, the blessed significance of those many symbols, types and shadows which had been strewn along the whole pathway of the Old Testament history of redemption, as means of illustrating the sense of divine promises, as lights illumining the mysteries of the spoken word, and rendering its import plainer.

Thus they fully understood what was meant when He was declared to have "come to seek and to save the lost." They had learned to know why He said to so many that received bodily healing at his hands, "thy sins are forgiven thee." When they heard or read of the mercy shown to Zaccheus the publican, they were at no loss rightly to apprehend the nature of the "salvation which that day came to his house." Neither were they in any doubt as to the significance of the soul-comforting testimony of Paul, that the Gospel of Jesus was "the power of God unto salvation," or of the declaration of Peter, that they were "redeemed

not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from their vain conversation received by tradition from their fathers."

Whether they pondered over the "tidings of great joy" proclaimed by angels to the shepherds, or listened with rapt amazement to the loud voice of the multitude of ransomed saints crying, as they sing around the heavenly throne: "Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb," they recognized with grateful hearts why the Lamb was called *Jesus*, as He who should save His people from their sins.

*How He did this,*

and so accomplish the work He had come to do, was equally well understood by them. It could hardly be otherwise. For a great purpose of divine revelation, as recorded in Scriptures, was to *make plain*, and unmistakably plain, this very point. Hence the rebuke of the risen Lord to the disciples on the way to Emmaus: "O fools (simple ones) and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken, ought not Christ to have suffered these things," &c.

How well they had come to understand the truth regarding this vital point, is manifest from the sacred writings of the Apostles in use among them, and showing what Gospel was preached among them, and received by them. From these we learn the following points:

I. They firmly believed and maintained that in order to man's salvation, the *first thing* demanded was, that the penalty of sin be fully paid, and so satisfaction be rendered to God for the transgression of His law.

Because "all had sinned," all the world had become "guilty before God," all were "under condemnation," under "a curse." The curse and condemnation were unto "death," temporal and eternal, actual and judicial. Both the truth and justice of God, as grounded in the infinite holiness of His being, required the execution of this penalty. The demands of the law must be satisfied either by the death of the sinner or of some one capable of taking the sinner's place.

How man should "justify himself before God" without enduring the eternal penalty, or, on the other hand, how "God could be just and yet justify the ungodly," was a problem which the wisdom of the world had for ages tried in vain to solve. But



what man could not do, God had in mercy done. The accomplishment of the needful grace was the burden of the Gospel. Apostolic Christians knew it, and with joyful gratitude accepted of the plan thus mercifully provided.

2. They beheld Jesus as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." They knew why He was called "the *Lamb of God*." The very designation pointed to a sacrifice, a propitiatory atoning sacrifice. With the idea of "a lamb for a sacrifice" they were familiar, having learned it from the "law and the prophets." When, therefore, it was said "Christ our Passover" is sacrificed for us, it was easy and natural for them to connect the saying with the summons of John the Baptist, to "behold the Lamb of God."

God had in many ways displayed His love to them. They were deeply sensible of this. But chiefly had He "commended it, in that while they were yet sinners, Christ had died for them." He that in Himself was harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners, "who knew no sin, was made sin (that is a sin-offering) for them." Because, therefore, "in due time Christ died for the ungodly," "bore our sins in His body on the tree," suffered to be "laid on Him the iniquity of us all," He was their *Jesus*.

To do this He had, of course, to be born. No Solomon was needed to tell them this. Had he not become incarnate, He could not have "died, the just for the unjust, to bring us unto God." That they well understood. To "give His life a ransom for many," He must have a life to give. And they were not slack to appreciate the mercy He showed in consenting to become "flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone." But they had better "learned Christ" than to be deluded by any pantheistic philosophy (busy as it was in their day already) into the mischievous anti-gospel error of imagining, that by His mere incarnation He saved men. For they knew that "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, *condemned sin in the flesh*." And thus, again, because they saw the death-penalty of sin inflicted upon the incarnate Son of God, who had become incarnate for this as a main purpose; and because they saw and knew that in this very way He "redeemed them (not by His birth but) by His precious blood, as of a lamb slain, without spot or blemish," they called Him their *Jesus*.

3. The name *Jesus*, therefore, taught them to look unto Him as their true high-priest "who, by the *offering of Himself* once for all," had "given His life a ransom for many." It meant for them salvation from the death of sin, from the curse of the law, by the atoning sacrificial death of Christ upon the cross. This they regarded as the ground and foundation of the redemption of the world. Whether they learned the doctrine from John the Baptist crying in the wilderness, or from John the banished on the isle of Patmos, it was the basis of their hope, and the theme of their thanksgivings—Christ the crucified, by whom, through His propitiatory death, they "received the atonement."

That such was the common and prevailing faith of the early Church, is testified on almost every page of the New Testament. Every where Christ is seen "evidently set forth as crucified among them," as Paul declares to the Galatians. In all the preaching and writings of the Apostles, the chief theme is, "Christ and *Him crucified*." It is "*blood of Christ* which cleanseth from all sin." As Jesus Himself had told them, that "greater love hath no man than this, that a man *lay down His life* for His fellows," so they saw in His death a chief purpose and significance of His person and His work. By it "a ransom was paid for sin." By it, as "the blood of the covenant," "the blood that speaketh better things than that of Abel," as "the blood of Christ who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God," were "their consciences purged from dead works to serve the living God." By it, as "a sacrifice of sweet-smelling savour acceptable to God," had they "access to the grace wherein they stood" and even "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." And, above all, it was "the death of Christ" as their Redeemer, not His birth, His incarnation, which they commemorated, according to His own command in the Holy Supper.

Thus from first to last—*Jesus* was a Saviour from sin, primarily by making atonement for it, and *so opening the way for whatever else was requisite to make the application of grace effective and complete*.

If now we ask yet,

*Why He was also Emmanuel,*

according to the primitive faith, we obtain for answer the simple assurance, that the nature of man's condemnation and misery was



such, that only God manifest in the flesh could save Him. They believed in the real and proper divinity of Jesus. They adored and worshiped Him as they did the Father. And they held that the "Word became flesh and dwelt among us," because only thus could human nature be enabled to endure the penalty of sin, and offer up a propitiation of sufficient merit. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us," avows their faith, as declaring that a vicarious offering of such divine excellence was indispensable.

As to the special sense in which Jesus was regarded as being Emmanuel, all the evidence proves clearly :

1. That early Christians *did not hold* the view of the incarnation which falsely teaches that it involved a pantheistic deification of the human race. On the contrary, their "faith" necessarily excludes such a notion, and so radically excludes it, that no development theory can ever legitimately derive that conceit from the early Christian theology. For though Jesus Christ was regarded as the new or second "*Adam*," as "*Head* over all things to His Church," no fair and sane exegesis would ever force such manifestly figurative terms in a literal sense.

2. They did hold that so far as the special union of the divine with the human nature in Christ was concerned, in "the Word made flesh," it was a union altogether peculiar to Jesus Christ, and not shared by perpetual conveyance or communication to His people, through baptism as a channel by a priest.

But on this point we cannot now enlarge.

---

#### FELLOWSHIP WITH JESUS.

JESUS, whom thy church doth own  
As her Head and King alone,  
Bless me, thy poor member, too;  
And Thy Spirit's influence give  
That to Thee henceforth I live;  
Daily Thou my strength renew.

Let Thy living Spirit flow  
Through Thy members all below,  
With His warmth and power divine;

Though asunder far they dwell,  
 Let Thy grace, Emmanuel,  
 In their hearts forever shine.

Unto all Thyself impart,  
 Fashioned after Thine own heart,  
 Make Thy children like to Thee;  
 Humble, pure, and calm, and still,  
 Loving, single as Thy will,  
 All as Thou wouldst have them be.

Dearly were we purchased, Lord,  
 When Thy blood for us was poured;  
 Keep us, Saviour, as Thine own!  
 Hold me, guide me, as a child,  
 Through the battle, through the wild,  
 Leave me never more alone.

Till at last we meet on high,  
 With the ransomed host who cry,  
 Worthy, thrice, the Lamb that died!  
 There from sin and sorrow free,  
 Face to face each one shall see  
 Christ the Lord, now glorified.

*Tersteegen, in Lyra Germ.*

---

#### THE REFORMED CONFESSIONS—HOW TO OBTAIN THEM.

##### *A Public Reply to a Private Letter.*

*Dear Bro.*—In your letter you state that you have become interested in some of the articles in the *Reformed Church Monthly*, in which quotations are given from the Reformed Confessions, which seem to prove that the modern Mercersburg doctrine is inconsistent with the faith of our fathers when it asserts and assumes “that ministers of the Gospel are Priests;” and you desire to know where you can obtain these Confessions, so that you can study them more fully for yourself.

It is a matter of very great importance that ministers of the Reformed Church should become acquainted with the Confessions and Creeds of the Reformed Church; that they should study them for themselves, and with their own eyes, and not take them at second



hand from those who are interested in carrying their own speculations over into these Confessions. They would then not so easily be led into erroneous views and very crude theories, as is so often the case now. If the brethren were better grounded in these old manifestations of the faith of our fathers, which were solemn expressions of a *faith that was real*, and born of the leadings of the Spirit, and not mere speculations, I do not believe that a single one of them could ever have become so far perverted as to go back to the superstitions of Rome. It is to me a horrible thought, that after the terrible conflict of our fathers with Romanism in the sixteenth century, and after the pouring out of their martyr blood in Germany, France and Holland *for this faith*, so many of their descendants (and some of them sons of most excellent ministers) should have been led back in our day into the corruptions of Rome, and that this should be calmly acquiesced in, and even apologized for and defended by those who ought to be more conscientious leaders.

It is a pity that these Confessions are not more generally accessible. If they were collected and published, in a good English form, and generally distributed among our ministers and members, they would certainly banish a great deal of the erroneous theological thinking that is now cast with so much complacency before the Church.

The Confession of the highest value and authority to us, is, of course, the Heidelberg Catechism. This is accessible to all. But having been prepared largely as a Catechism for the use of the Church,\* it does not touch upon all of the points in which our fathers were very decided in their opposition to Rome, of whose corruptions they had not a merely ideal, but a very real and personal knowledge. Next in order, both in respect to authority in all branches of the Reformed Church, and in completeness and fullness, is the "Second Helvetic," sometimes called the "Latter Confession of Helvetia," to distinguish it from a previous briefer Confession called the "First Helvetic" or "Former Confession of

---

\*The Heidelberg Catechism was meant to serve a two-fold purpose:

1. As a suitable text-book of doctrines for the instruction of the people. It must be remembered that the first members of our Church were converts from Popery, who as Papists had been kept in ignorance of the great doctrines of grace, and hence needed much instruction. For the use of children and youth a *Compendium* was published almost simultaneously with the Catechism.

2. As a Reformed *Confession of faith*, in the ordinary sense of that term.

Helvetia." These are *Swiss* Creeds, the original home of the Reformed Church.

This "Second Helvetic" you will find translated into English, and published in full, in monthly installments, in the *Reformed Church Monthly*, commencing with the number for Sept., 1872, (where an account is also given of all the Reformed Confessions, which it will be well to refer to), and running through the monthly numbers to December, 1873.

In reply to your question *where* and *how* to obtain copies of all these Confessions, I answer:

1. The standard collection of the *principal Reformed Confessions* is in Latin (since they were nearly all originally published in Latin), and the book can be obtained from "Smith, English & Co., of Philadelphia. The title is "Niemeyer (Dr. H. I.) Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatonum," Leipzig, 1840. The Philadelphia house keeps it generally on hand, and sells it for \$5, or less.

2. If an English copy is desired, it will be found difficult to obtain one without importing it from England. Still, if ordered through the above house, they can generally succeed in obtaining (often a second-hand copy) an old work which is very valuable. It is an English translation of a work that was drawn up in 1581, on the continent, to show the substantial harmony between all the Protestant Confessions (as over against the errors of Rome), and it includes most of the principal Reformed Confessions, together with a majority of the Lutheran ones, (but not the Formula of Concord.) It gives these Confessions *in full*, but arranged under separate chapters or heads (like a treatise on theology), which is very convenient when you wish to refer to particular subjects, or when you desire to become acquainted with the Reformation views as held in both Churches. The translation I have found to be, *generally*, very good, clear and faithful. But in cases in dispute, we have of course to fall back upon the Latin originals in Niemeyer. The latest English edition of this work is entitled "The Harmony of Protestant Confessions, by Rev. Peter Hall," London, 1840, 640 pages. Under this title you can order it from Smith, English & Co. It may perhaps be well to give here a list of the Confessions contained in this work.

1. Augsburg Confession.
2. The Tetrapolitana.



3. The Confession of Basle.
4. The First Helvetic.
5. The Second Helvetic.
6. The Confession of Saxony.
7. The Confession of Wurtemberg.
8. " " of France.
9. " " of England.
10. " " of Belgia.
11. " " of Bohemia.
12. " " of Scotland.
13. The 39 Articles of the Church of England.
14. The 19 " " " " of Ireland.
15. Decrees of the Synod of Dort.
16. Westminster Confession of Faith.

I learn from Dr. Schaff that he has in press a work on the Creeds of all branches of the Christian Church. This will be valuable, but it will not contain a full list of the Reformed Confessions. On account of its length he could not even find room for the most important one of all, namely, the Second Helvetic.

3. If a German copy is desired, I think you will find no difficulty in obtaining one. A very convenient and good edition is the following: "Die Confessionen der Reformirten Kirche, von John Jacob Mess," Neuwied, 1846. It is in three small volumes, very complete, very accurate, and cheap. I have no doubt the "Pilger Buch-handlung," in Reading, Pa., can import a copy. This collection embraces the following Confessions:

1. The Second Helvetic.
2. The First Helvetic.
3. The Basle of 1532.
4. The Basle of 1534.
5. The Tetrapolitana.
6. Heidelberg Catechism.
7. The Confession of John Sigismund.
8. The Leipzig Colloquy.
9. Declaration of Thorn.
10. The Augsburg Confession.
11. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.
12. The Scotch Confession.
13. The Smaller Catechism.
14. The Gallic Confession.

15. Calvin's Catechism.
16. The Belgic Confession.
17. The Confession of Poland.
18. The Hungarian Confession.

I notice in the Catalogue of the Pilger Buch-handlung that they have on hand "Bodeman, F. W., Sammlung der Wichtigsten Bekenntniss-schriften der Ref. Kirche," price only 85 cents. This work I am not acquainted with, and do not know how complete and correct it may be.

4. In order to obtain the *complete series* of Confessions, still another work must be obtained. The *principal Confessions*, as given in the above book, are of course the most important, from the fact that they were approved by and expressed the faith of nearly all the branches of the Reformed family. But besides these, particular lands (in Germany) adopted special Confessions, which are very important if we wish to know what were the opinions of the fathers. They are often more full on particular points than the other Confessions. These were for the first time gathered together, and published in one volume (German, of course, as they were written in that language), in 1860, by Dr. Henry Heppe (Reformed) of the University of Marburg, published in Elberfeld. The title of the work is "Die Bekenntnisschriften der Reformirten Kirchen Deutschlands, von Dr. H. Heppe," Elberfeld, 1860, 310 pages. It includes the following Confessions:

1. Confession of Frederick III. of the Palatinate.
2. Anhalt Confession.
3. Nassau Confession.
4. Bremen Confession.
5. Hessian Confession.
6. Confession of the Heidelberg Theologians of 1607, entitled "What the Reformed Churches in Germany do believe, and do not believe."

This book is often bound up together with another work by Dr. Heppe, entitled "Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-Reformirten Kirche," 520 pages, which is the most valuable work extant for any one who wishes to become acquainted with the Reformed Theology of the age of the Reformation and the subsequent century, as it gives (in German) a very faithful portrayal of the dogmatic views of the Reformed Theological writers, together with most copious citations (in Latin) from their works. It must have



cost Dr. Heppe an immense labor to compile it. All the theological works of the Reformed Professors of Theology in the various schools and universities in Germany, Holland, Switzerland and France, for nearly a century after the Reformation (and numbering upwards of 50 distinct works), had to be carefully studied, and the appropriate citations from each given in full. It was written for the express purpose of giving to every scholar the means of ascertaining the views and teachings of these 50 theologians, *in their own words*.

These two books together make a large volume of 800 pages, which costs about \$4. I notice that the Pilger establishment has on hand the "Dogmatik of Heppe, price \$2.15." If they do not have the former work (the "Confessions,") no doubt they will willingly import it.

If you get either Mess or Bodeman, and in addition Heppe's two works, you will have (in German,) a very complete collection of Confessions and Dogmatical writings of the age of the Reformation, and the hundred years subsequent. A careful study and perusal of these will show how far, how very far many have departed in these latter days from the foundations laid by the fathers, and you will be astonished at the same time at the ignorance of the doctrines of the Reformed Church often displayed.

J. H. G.

---

THE FREDERICK APPEAL CASE.\*

The appeal of elder T. A. Rice from the decision of the consistory of the Evangelical Reformed congregation in Frederick city, to the Classis of Maryland, and from it to the Synod of the Potomac, has attracted considerable attention in the Reformed Church. We had been anxious to hear the case tried by Synod, and to become more fully acquainted with the facts it involved.

From the facts developed in the trial, we became fully satisfied

---

\*We have no disposition whatever to produce any thing in this article that might unnecessarily reflect on the consistory or membership of the congregation in Frederick. Personally, we have no acquaintance with any of the members of the same. We take for granted, however, they are Christian gentlemen, worthy of respect. From articles which appeared in the *Christian World*, we could not avoid the impression that unwise counsel, from Lancaster or elsewhere, more than any thing else, has been the cause of the course pursued by the majority of the consistory, and consequently also the cause of the complicated troubles in which the Frederick congregation has been involved.

that the course of the consistory was—to say the least—unfortunate and unjustifiable.

We take for granted that the consistory, when it nominated the first candidate for the pastorate of the congregation, entertained the hope that the proposed nominee was the right man and would be elected. The defeat of the first candidate, however, was sufficient to indicate that a man identified with the other tendency in the Church would be preferred.

However, instead of yielding their own individual preferences to the will of the majority of the members of the congregation, the consistory nominated a second candidate. He, too, was identified with the Mercersburg-Lancaster Theology. And he, too, was defeated. This placed the matter beyond a reasonable doubt, that the majority of the voting members of the Frederick congregation preferred a man identified with the other tendency in the Church.

Rev. T. J. Bacher, from Fremont, Ohio, having preached for the congregation, it was anxiously desired that the consistory would bring him before the congregation as a candidate. This not being done, a petition drawn up in a respectful manner, was circulated in the congregation and afterwards presented to the consistory with 73 names to it, praying the consistory to nominate the Rev. T. J. Bacher, as candidate for the pastorate of the congregation. But even this petition, signed by so large a number of the members, was not granted.

It having become evident through the facts just stated that the majority of the consistory would not yield to the wishes of the majority of the congregation, but in an independent, arbitrary way, pursue its own course and nominate whom it pleased, the people resolved to assert their rights by way of an appeal to Classis, from the decision of the consistory in which it had refused to grant the prayer of the petitioners. Elder T. A. Rice, one of their number, took the appeal, and the appeal not being sustained by Maryland Classis, was brought before the Synod of the Potomac, by an appeal from its decision.

1. With these facts before us, we naturally concluded that the course of the consistory was arbitrary and unyielding. The conduct of its members in the case clearly indicates that they had some particular end or object in view, for the accomplishment of which they were willing to ignore the rights and defeat the wishes



of the majority of the voting members of the Church. Having it in their power to defeat them by refusing to heed their just and reasonable request, they exercised that power in an arbitrary, unjustifiable way.

The Rev. J. Spangler Kieffer, counsel for Maryland Classis, affirmed that the consistory, by the ordination vows of its members, is bound to watch over the interests of the Church, and to do whatever in its judgment will best promote her welfare, independent of the wishes of the members. He assumed that the majority of the members might frequently desire the consistory to do what would be unwise and even absurd. He claimed that it was not only in the power, but also the duty of the consistory, in such cases, to refuse to grant the petitions of the people, no matter how large the number of the petitioners.

The position taken by Mr. K. is partly correct. The consistory of a congregation is not bound to do *any* thing it may be petitioned to do, by the members. It must make everything in its power subservient to the best interests of the congregation, no matter what may be the wishes of the people. And that this may be done, it is vested with power to proceed according to the decisions of its best judgment.

This, however, does not imply that the consistory must, or even may, resist the will of the people when they are right in their demands. Just here lies the trouble in the case before us. The counsel for Maryland Classis, after having taken his position as just given, to make any thing out of his argument, should have shown that the seventy-three petitioners asking the consistory to bring before the congregation as candidate, the Rev. T. J. Bacher, asked the consistory to do what was "absurd," or "injurious." Having done this, he should next in order have given reasons or considerations why the consistory could not grant what the petitioners asked. But he failed to do this.

He could not and did not venture to say that what the petitioners asked, was unreasonable, "absurd" or "injurious." Nor did he attempt to bring forward any argument to show that the request should not have been granted, except the assertion that the consistory is not bound to follow or carry out the wishes of the people, where the same may be "absurd," &c.

As this statement did not apply to the case in hand, his argument amounted to nothing.

It was unfortunate for the defense that it could not be shown that the petitioners asked for something that was wrong, and that not even an attempt was made, in any logical way, to show that the request of the petitioners was injurious.

Another damaging feature on this side of the controversy, is the fact that the statements of both sides, by the counsel, made it clear beyond a doubt, that the majority in the consistory set themselves up against an overwhelmingly large majority in the congregation. This was fully shown by the defeat of the two candidates which the consistory had brought before the congregation. The candidates were, Rev. J. S. Kieffer, from Hagerstown, and Dr. T. G. Apple, professor of theology in the Seminary at Lancaster. The former was a young man, the latter a brother of more advanced years. Both are able, and among the most prominent and popular men identified with the Mercersburg-Lancaster theology and the liturgical tendency of the New "Order of Worship."

With all the advantages of these brethren, personal and others, a *large* majority of the votes cast at the elections, of which they were the candidates, was against them. According to the statements given by the counsel of the appellant, in the *Christian World*, 19 votes were cast in favor of, and 62 against the candidate from Hagerstown; and in the case of Dr. Apple, 25 were for, and 58 against him.

We have given these statements to show the more fully what the sentiments and wishes of the people were, as brought out and made clear to the consistory by the elections noticed. These events having taken place previously, the act of the consistory refusing to bring before the congregation the candidate asked for by the petitions of a large majority of the voters of the congregation, appears extremely arbitrary and unwise. This is the more so, as no justifiable reasons could be given for the course pursued in the case.

2. The policy of the consistory was a serious hindrance to the settlement of a pastor in the Frederick congregation. It was important in this, as it is in all other cases after the death or removal of the pastor, to secure the labors of a suitable successor, so soon as practicable. In the peculiar state of things in this congregation, it became necessary to proceed cautiously, and in order to prevent an increase of troubles and difficulties, to seek a



suitable man on whom the majority could unite without any unnecessary delay. The desired candidate was before the minds of the people. They respectfully asked to have him nominated in order that further troubles and divisions might be avoided and those already in existence healed. Under these circumstances, by the course pursued, existing evils necessarily were increased and the congregation left without a pastor.

3. The evil results that would naturally follow may easily be inferred. The congregation, already distracted, was left without the wholesome and healing influences of a suitable pastor. The different sentiments entertained by the people developed party feeling. Party feeling would naturally run out into open contentions and strife. Thus the troubles naturally would grow worse from day to day.

4. The course of the consistory looks very much as if they had pursued some party object or design to gratify the personal feelings of the majority of its members. If this was not the case, it should have been shown when the merits of the case were discussed before Synod. Satisfactory reasons (if such existed) should have been given in justification of the policy they carried out in their conduct. The fact that no such reasons were given in justification of their policy, is very damaging to their cause.

5. The facts in the case show that the consistory did not show due respect for the will of the people, by whom its members had been put in office. If the people are competent to determine by vote who are the right persons that should fill the offices of the church, they are also competent to form some idea of what would be likely to be best for the interests of the congregation. Especially would they be able to form a correct idea as to who would be likely to be an acceptable pastor over them. The constitution of the church presumes this to be the fact. Here the membership of the church, as such, and not the consistory, elect their pastors. This feature of the constitution the consistory dare not ignore. *The will of the people must be duly respected.* It is just here where, in so many of our congregations, under the care of the advocates of the new "Order of Worship," the rights of the people are not duly respected.

The members of consistories are not lords over God's heritage. They are servants. They are placed in office to direct the affairs of the congregations over which they preside. They are required

to render all the services they can for the promotion of the highest interests of the same. Their own individual preferences must be sacrificed, if necessary, for the general good. In their official capacity they are not only servants of God, but also servants of the people. In their official capacity they should be careful to avoid all occasions of strife and division. In no other thing is this so important as in the bringing before vacant congregations suitable candidates for the pastorate. The members have their preferences, some for one, others for another man. By delay, and especially by any *unnecessary* delay, troubles are most likely to spring up. These soon become complicated. Evil results follow.

It is better to comply with the wishes of the people, if not arbitrary or injurious, than to cause contention and divisions in a congregation. According to the statements given in the *Christian World*, that part of the Frederick congregation which has taken the appeal up to Classis and from it to the Synod, were desirous of having the present pastor taken up as a candidate from the start. The dominant party in the consistory, it seems, were not satisfied with him, and therefore nominated one more extremely liturgical. The unfortunate results have been dissatisfaction, contention and appeals.

In the complicated difficulties in which the Frederick congregation has become involved, we have another striking example of the unfortunate workings of the new Order of Worship. During the long pastorate of Dr. Zacharias, so successful and so highly esteemed by his congregation, peace and good will prevailed among his people. Whatever may have been his views and preferences, he showed due respect to the preferences of the people and the order of things in which they had always been accustomed to have the public services of the sanctuary conducted.

Had a conservative, prudent man, been chosen, no matter with which of the two parties or tendencies in the church he stood united, the same order of things to which the congregation had been accustomed, would have been continued. There would have been no law suit, no complaints, nor appeals. So soon, however, as it was attempted to get a pastor extreme in high-church views and practices, the trouble which has since terminated in the most complicated difficulties, began.

These difficulties and the unfortunate results growing out of them, should be allowed to have their weight in preventing other



consistories and congregations from adopting the policy carried out by the Frederick consistory. The case in hand, like others in which a similar course in some respects has been pursued, shows the tendency of the new order of things it has been attempted to introduce into our churches. Alienation, dissatisfaction, and a host of other evils follow. Among these is the loss of whole families which leave the Reformed Church to connect with other communions.

EQUITY.

---

#### A CRY FOR HELP.

HELP, help, I perish! Such is the cry of despairing "*Mittlemass*" *Messenger*. It was heard on the floor of the Synod of the Potomac, and doubtless it was reiterated before the Synod of the United States, for these Synods are united in the unblessed work of supporting the Publication interest and "*the Institution*" at Lancaster. The "acts and proceedings" of the Synod of the Potomac on hearing this shriek for help, will set forth how the appeal was answered. It will command attention for its spirit, if not for the claim it sets up. The question before the Synod was narrowed to what must be done? What can be done in the premises? The alternative was a terrible one for those whose *pliant organ* it had been; new subscribers must be had for it or it *must* die. The Board of Publication cannot carry both *its* dead weight, and that of the "*Mercersburg Review*." If it die, where can place be found for "the Theology and Criticisms" of our beloved Professors? The pent-up humor at Lancaster will have no way to ventilate itself, and the church will lose this rare delicacy. If it must shut up its columns, then how will it be possible to circulate those very modest and delicate compliments from week to week with which the writers are wont to soothe each other to the delectation of the public. If it *does* die, where can be chronicled the cheerful and rapid adoption of the order of worship and its happy results when used. In that event where can the valuable contributions of "*our special*" correspondents see the light and

with their racy contents arouse the enthusiasm of the church? Such disaster must not even be supposed. It must be averted as a calamity. How is this to be compassed? Oh, easily! Synod has but to require or order its ministers to circulate *the Messenger*, or have some one do it *for* them. Only get *new* subscribers to a number that will pay, and it is done at once. Yes, *require* them to do it if they be loth to take hold. If they or any of them fail or refuse, drive them to it, in the chaste and nervous language of the Rev. Dr. Higbee, as "mules and horses are driven with a whip." We have some thoughts to offer that suggest themselves on this cry for help and "the enforcement" order of those who may wish to control the Synod of the Potomac.

1. *The principle or want of principle that underlies the conduct of that "authorized Publication" are such as should destroy it.* Its motto, "mittlemass ist die beste strass," is neither of Christ nor is it manly. Our Lord acted from no such policy, neither did he allow or ever commend it. "He that is not with me is against me—and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad," expressed his mind on this matter. These words express what is significant and direct. No mittlemass has room here. For or against Christ—for or against the old Reformed faith—for or against the truth. In the application of this specious motto, the *Messenger* claims to be the authorized organ of the Reformed Church, while its columns teem with all the heresies of Mercersburg. Not in an open manly way, but in a jesuitical manner; often saying one thing and meaning another. Such mittlemass dodging is distasteful to the honest, christian people of the Reformed Church, and as a consequence they do not support it, and it is dying by inches and is only kept alive by *active* stimulants. This foreshadows a sad ending for a paper that has for years striven for its existence and a recognition by the church—that has subsidized the talent of the Mercersburg faction in the church—that has had given to it the *many-sided* gifts of its Editor, who has tried with some success to be all things to all men. But God seems to be against it. The thousands of readers in the families of the two Eastern Synods do not take kindly to it, and it does not prosper. All the canvassing of partisans does not make it grow. Does God remember and avenge the wrong done to his own loved ones who have at times been assaulted by it and maligned in its pages? Is he avenging treachery toward his dear old servant—the Reformed Church?



And is He against it as an enemy of his truth and of his Christ?

2. *With all due respect for the learned and astute Doctors who may be trying to manipulate the Synod of the Potomac, we do directly question their right to order or require the ministers in their bounds, under pain of being driven with a whip as horses and mules, to become canvassers for new subscribers to their organ.* It is only by an extra constitutional assumption of power that a Synod can with its *order or requisition* reach a minister, excepting through his Classis. It is to his Classis that a minister is accountable for his official fidelity, and the Synod can only reach him when his conduct is brought before them by appeal or complaint. A Synod can reach *its Professors*, but not a minister, in this inquisitorial manner; neither is it within the province of a Classis "to require" of a minister of Jesus Christ to become a canvasser for subscription to a newspaper, and even though it be an "authorized" church paper. It is no part of his work in the care of souls, even when he approved of all the teachings of such paper and could honestly and truthfully commend it to the people of his charge. It is not in the right of any church court to demand of a minister that which his ordination vow does not obligate him to do—that which is not properly part of his office—that which the Lord Christ has not laid on him. It is only an act of usurpation and tyranny when it is done. Such men or court usurp the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only head of the Church. An unmanly tyranny at the best. Christ has delegated to no Court—to no small Pope—to no Priest or Doctor, the power to require of his brother or even of his *servant* to do that which his fealty to Christ or His Gospel forbids him—that which in a good conscience he holds will minister to the propagation of error. No Synod's dictum can be a conscience for an honest minister as authority against his sense of duty to the Lord Christ. We are greatly mistaken if those ministers and elders against whom this edict is directed—for whose special benefit this ukase is promulgated—will in the least be affected by it. As they are conscious that Christ has made them free with his own freedom, so will they never suffer themselves to come under *bondage* to any man, or church court. The Reformed Church has ever boasted of its liberty—it is *the* gem in her crown—its members never have bowed their necks to priestly arrogance. As long as they remain the *sons* of their sires, so

long they will never in this free land submit to compulsion, and they will never consent to do what is wrong in their judgment, although that judgment be *private*. We care not how soon those now drunken with power and conceit may make the attempt. It will then be found that those who oppose error and the usurpation of unconstitutional power, present an undivided front, and that no fear of ghostly power or wrath can intimidate them or break their unity.

3. *The exceeding folly of those who attempt such acts of oppression must come from maddened, blinded men.* Such are the deeds, however, that are needed to arouse the members of our Reformed Churches. Here is seen and learned the spirit of Mercersburg. Their success must, however, work the ruin of their cause, as it ever does of a bad cause. If anything were needed to impress on the minds of our people that this spirit, so alien from the Reformed ministry of the past, is but the spirit of the usurping and tyrannous Church of Rome, and that it is in imitation of *her* priests, this does it. But it will not take long for our would-be masters to learn that the Reformed Church and its ministry is not a crowd of ignorant Irish, or of priest-ridden Germans. Who are these men? Whence do they inherit this spirit? He who would drive God's servants with a whip, "as mules and horses are driven," inherits his spirit from those who drove Roger Williams into the wilderness to receive that charity of the Red man which the *christians* denied him—for those whose rigors doomed the meek and gentle Quaker to prison and the gibbet. It is remarkable what fatuous things are done in our church by those men who have come of another spirit and another church, and do not know what spirit the Reformed Church is of, and yet would rule her people—subvert her life and defraud her of her inheritance and her faith. Is it not time that true men—men whose birthright is in the Church, and who have not sold it for the mess of pottage that makes them the creature of the stranger, should rise up in resistance to such an usurpation? The sons of the church may now fully estimate their value in the sight of such upstart strangers. He and those with him would treat them as brutes are treated, and lash them into obedience to *their* commands. Poor Reformed Church, that is asked to hold such spirit in reverence, and honor the *masters of the whip*.

4. *This despairing cry for help—this frenzied effort to compel the*



*support of the Church to the Messenger, sets forth the estimate in which its teachings and spirit are held by the members of our Reformed Church.* It is indeed a wholesome sign, and the friends of truth and the Church may well rejoice that its power to do harm is so circumscribed, while it is pressed on the people by every available argument—while its columns abound with the choicest ideas of its specials, A., D., G.; still the plain, honest members of our Church do not relish these things. Premiums, changes of form, etc., are resorted to—reduction of price and a large free list, all are employed, and yet it cannot be made to pay. Our good people do not feel that it is the organ of their faith, and they doubt its being loyally Reformed. What an ungracious business to canvass for such a paper; and yet those who disavow its teachings are to insist that their churches shall patronize it—threaten, cajole and subsidize them if they would succeed. If they fail to do this—if their soul revolts at such service—then Dr. Higbee and his *confreres* will drive them to it with the whip, as the mule and horse is driven. It is refreshing to believe that the people will sustain their ministers in a refusal to obey this mandate, and that when the whip is applied it will be found that *the people* feel the smart. We are ready, O Driver. Get thy whip, thou son of the Puritan! But be warned that the first mule or horse that you attempt to drive with your scourges, it will arouse the indignation of thousands of free, true, christian men all over the mountains and vales of this broad land that will determine the doom of the priestly arrogance now on the rampage, and that will make the usurper of the whip and his abettors wiser if not better men. We would, before we lay down our pen, suggest to Dr. Higbee, that he lay down his whip and listen to words of soberness. Not to think that he has mules and horses to deal with, but conscientious and reasonable men—that he seek to find the cause of their unwillingness to engage in the extra ministerial work of canvassing their charges for new subscribers to the *Messenger*—that he acquaint himself with the causes that have brought or kept that paper in this dying estate. Surely its age, prestige and all, should have given it a popularity that needed no canvass to get new subscribers. Let your whip lie, Dr., and set to work to make the *Messenger* what our Reformed people will want in their homes. Make it attractive. Make it Reformed in its teachings. Have it sail under true colors. Do this, and make a fresh, live and interesting paper, and you

will not need to pass such resolutions that speak the shame of the paper and the desperation of those who introduce and support it. Do this, and make the *Messenger* a christian paper in our Reformed sense, and you will not need your whip, and you will become ashamed of your speech and blush to think that you ever uttered it.

ULRIC.

---

### PUSEYISM.

#### *Its Pretensions, Aims, Arts, &c.*

ENGLISH Puseyism has claimed from the start to be true and loyal to the church within which it took its rise and is mainly carrying on its mischievous work. Its *avowed* aim, at least at the commencement of its efforts, was merely to correct some evils which, it said, had crept into the Episcopal church, to lead the church back to its proper position, and to develop more fully certain principles which, as it asserted, had never been properly developed.

All this looked very plausible, and seemed quite praiseworthy. And as those who led off and advocated the movement were men of some standing and influence, and seemed to defend their course in a very earnest and impressive way, many ministers of the church were drawn into the movement.

Its prime movers took great pains to show up the *evils* which, professedly, were to be remedied, in their worst light, very much as Dr. J. W. Nevin exposed the evils of religious fanaticism in his little book called the "Anxious Bench," and the miserable evils, as he called them, of free prayer, and our old Reformed mode of worship, in his tract called "The Liturgical Question." And as *Newman* (who soon apostatized to Rome) was really a very honest as well as learned man, and *Pusey* got credit for being equally so, this way of exposing and harping upon the "*unchurchly and unsacramental Christianity*," which they and their helpers declared to



be crying evils in their church, had its effect, especially upon the minds of young men preparing for the ministry.

*Its Artifices and Devices.*

By the "cunning craftiness" of its measures and modes of operation, Puseyism has set an example which all errorists "lying in wait to deceive" may well copy. First, it laid itself out for *undermining* any evangelical Protestant principles on which the Episcopal church rested. It labored to shake confidence in such principles, and to create strong misgivings in regard to them. It knew very well that it was easier to overthrow the citadel of truth in the minds and hearts of men by slowly weakening or destroying its foundations, than by openly assailing its walls and bastions.

*Next*, it spoke and wrote kindly and apologetically of some of the chief peculiarities of Popery. This was not done so much openly and by name, as under disguise (*sub-rosa*.) It would hardly have done to come out at once in advocacy of the Mass, of sacerdotalism, of the confessional, and such like Romish abominations. This would have betrayed the scheme, and shocked honest minds and hearts.

Instead of risking its cause in this way, and letting people see what it was after, a much more specious method was adopted. Pusey and his disciples professed to draw their inspiration from *early Christianity* of the *third* and *fourth* centuries. They declared their desire and purpose to be to restore that form of Christianity. Church fathers, like the noted *Cyprian*, were in great favor with them. The sacerdotalism, churchliness, and sacramentalism of such *honored* fathers of the Christian church were exceedingly precious to Puseyite hearts. We do not know that *Pusey* ever said that if the apostles could come back to earth they would find Romish churches more to their taste, with their images, high-altar, mass, robed priests, and mitred bishops in gowns of purple, gold and white, than our plain Reformed churches, with their simple arrangements, and spiritual, unritualistic worship. But it is quite likely that Pusey and his faithful followers thought so, and they encouraged others to think so.

Mark, by *early Christianity*, they did not mean primitive apostolic Christianity. To be logical, consistent, they should have gone back to that. Instead of rushing to the stream at a point,

reached after running three hundred years, when it had already become very muddy, and its waters were full of poisonous matter, they should have followed it up to the fountain-head. Had they really been intent upon restoring their church (if this was needful) to Gospel purity, they would doubtless have done so. But this does not seem to have suited their purpose. So they plead for a revival of something like *Cyprianic Christianity*.

Of course they were shrewd enough to know that if only they could get the third and fourth century Christianity into favor again, they would gain an important point, and open the way for something else. And this they could do without people seeing what they were actually trying to effect. That Pusey knew that all the worst elements of Popery were included in the (patristic) early Christianity thus recommended, can hardly be questioned.

In this way, then, Puseyism created a taste for the Popery, which grew as naturally out of the Christianity which more or less prevailed among its favorite fathers of the fourth century, as dragons grow in poisonous equatorial swamps. It took good care, however, not openly to advocate Popery, and, also, to conceal the close "organic connection" here, between causes and effects. Indeed, it sometimes, when found expedient, could seem to hit Rome hard blows. Above all, it repelled with indignation the charge of being Romish in its tendency, and affected to be greatly wronged and wounded by such "slandrous accusations."

Misrepresentations, gross misrepresentations, it frequently cried, when its peculiar notions and aims were exposed. It complained of being misunderstood also, and vilified; that its views were shamefully *travestied*, and wrongly set forth by *garbled quotations*.

Such assertions and complaints it knew would have the effect of at least confusing and perplexing the minds of many persons who had not the means or time to look up proofs. Pusey's word, to many, would have as much weight as that of his opponents. And as a large number of people would suppose it hardly possible that a gentleman, a Christian, and a professor, could be so dishonest as to remain in a church whose faith he no longer held, and remain there only to subvert its faith, many would feel inclined to suppose that there might be some mistake in the charges made against the movement. They forget that the prophets of Baal under Ahab, and Ahab himself, pretended to be good, honest



Israelites, and remained in outward fellowship with the Israelitish church long after they had in heart apostatized from the worship of Jehovah. Nay, they seem to forget that Ahab and his Baal priests, being in power, slew all the true prophets of the Lord on whom they could lay their hands, denouncing them as troublers of Israel, so that Elijah cried, "I only am left."

By such artful means, deceptions, concealments, affected zeal for the revival and restoration of a purer Christianity, did Puseyism press its measures and gain its successes. It wrote tracts, essays, poetry, (Keble's Christian year,) talked, preached, sent out its emissaries far and wide, ever disseminating a few leading doctrines, and by scattering them, pressing them, or denying them in their only true sense, and holding them forth artfully, sought to gain its point.

What peculiar doctrines it taught, and how it taught them, will be shown in another article. But whatever it did to further its scheme, it always *carefully avoided a fair and square issue*. Any one can see the shrewed policy of this evasive artifice. If it had drawn up its views in full form, and in some regular, systematic, connected way declared its tenets, and then submitted them to a Synod for approval or rejection, it was easy to foresee the result. So Puseyism carefully shunned this honest plan. It rather wrote and published its views piecemeal, and in detached articles, leaving the thing to work its way, just as "the enemy did when he sowed tares."

#### *The Fruits*

of Puseyism, in the Episcopal church, have been, in a few words,

First, that many scores of Episcopal ministers and not a few members have apostatized to Popery.

Secondly, the Episcopal church is distracted with dissensions about ritualism and false doctrines. And,

Thirdly, there have been untold losses to the church, by some members becoming sceptics, like Newman's brother, and others joining other churches.

Does all this teach us any practical lessons? Then let the reader gather and employ them for himself. They are pretty plain and easy to be seen.

---

HE who gives a trifle meanly is far meaner than the trifle.

## TIED OF CONTROVERSY.

Who are tired of it? Those who have excited it; whose false teaching and whose attempts to revolutionize the Reformed Church according to their anti-Reformed and unscriptural views and speculations have it made necessary either to abandon the Church to the most hurtful errors, or to resist by controversy the false doctrines taught; are they tired of controversy? Are the leaders of Mercersburg-Lancaster Theology, including most of the Professors, tired of controversy? If they are, they have a very strange way of showing it, teaching, preaching, writing as they are week after week, and as they have been now for many long years (about thirty) articles, essays, sermons, published in their *Review*, and in their *Messenger*, making all sorts of controversial assaults upon Protestantism and Protestant denominations.

*Vexed, Not Weary.*

They doubtless *are* tired of having their many errors exposed so plainly, and opposed so earnestly. Often they may feel bitterly vexed, and something worse than vexed, at finding their disguises uncovered, and anti-Protestant, Romish tenets laid bare to the gaze of the Church. Men engaged in the work they have undertaken with such unhappy zeal, may of course be greatly annoyed at finding their schemes thwarted and their expectations frustrated. As often as they use their ritualistic Order of Worship, they are probably grieved to the quick to think that, after all their toil and pains, the thing is practically a failure, and that the Church rejects their book. This is easily understood.

No doubt it would be more agreeable if every tongue that has been speaking against them and their measures could be silenced, and every pen wielded in the exposure of their errors could be burned. They have always shown utter impatience of contradiction. It would, of course, be far more pleasant to them to be allowed to teach, to preach and to write what they please, and to find the whole Church willing to sit in admiring silence at their feet, and with meek, acquiescing docility "receive the law at their mouth." This they seem to have long desired, even as they have long tried to secure it, and sometimes by very questionable methods. They would rejoice if the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY could, in this respect, be suppressed, and its editors and contribu-



tors suppressed too. Attempts looking to so ardently desired a result have not been wanting. Then, *perhaps*, Lancaster might have a "clear track," and be able, without let or hindrance, to run the whole eastern portion of the Church their own way, and to their own "desired haven," or might go on "decimating" this part of the Church.

*Not Tired of Doing Mischief.*

But however tired of *opposition*, is the Lancaster party really weary of propagating its pernicious errors—*weary of scattering the tares* of hurtful doctrines broadcast over our ecclesiastical fields? No, it is not. It is engaged in this worst kind of controversy as busily persistently, to-day as it was ten years ago. To carry it on more effectually, it has secured a separate department of "theology and criticism" in the *Messenger*, and thus indefatigably uses a paper which the Church must pay for, as a weapon of controversy against some of the essential doctrines of the Church. The *Mercersburg Review*, it seems, does not give the leaders of the party sufficient scope for their untiring zeal and determined purpose to fight down the old faith of the Church, and to fight up their wretched substitute for that faith.

No; the Lancaster party are not weary of controversy, excepting only as far as it contends against them and their views, and may be frustrating their revolutionizing schemes.

These remarks apply, of course, more or less fully to all who are in open and active sympathy with Lancaster. They may say they are tired of the controversy. They may even think they are, and seemingly plead for peace. But if they would thoroughly look into their hearts, would they not find that they are deceiving themselves? Would they not discover that it is not the *struggle* they deplore, but the poor progress which the cause of their party is making in the church? Most assuredly those ministers who voted for certain matters before the recent *Potomac Synod*, including the wholesale calumnious condemnation of Reformed ministers who will not let the Professors at Lancaster teach or defend baptismal regeneration, sacerdotal absolution, and that *not the death* but the incarnation (organic conjunction) of Christ is the ground and foundation of our redemption, without protesting against such errors—surely, we say, those so voting at Hanover, will not try to make people believe that they are tired of controversy!

*But Who are Tired*

of this long-continued struggle? We answer :

1. Some of our ministers and members who have not the opportunity or disposition to make themselves acquainted with the vital issues involved in it. There are many persons who do not consider that Gospel truth is worth more than worldly peace and ease, who are worried by the agitation and excitement of the controversy, and would have it quelled only so as to secure respite from strife. If their home were invaded by strangers who would begin turning things upside down, and even try to turn them out, they would not yield without an earnest struggle. But of *this* controversy they are weary and sick, because they will not take the trouble to inform themselves of its occasion and its immense importance for the church of their fathers.
2. Others are tired of it because they allow themselves to be deceitfully persuaded that it is all about matters of small importance, or that it has been gotten up by a few "troublers in Israel." Those who try to produce this impression are generally zealous disciples of the new Order errors and measures, and know better. They often succeed, however, in misleading people in this way, and in making them restive under the protracted contest.
3. But most positively and really are *those* weary of the controversy *who* most fully understand what it involves, and most sincerely lament the occasion of it. It is to them a constant grief that there should be men in the Church whose attempts to subvert her faith have rendered the conflict unavoidable. They are often sick at heart at being compelled by duty to Gospel truth, by their solemn official vows and pledges, by their love for the faith of their Church, to contend so earnestly and often so warmly against those with whom they would greatly prefer to be at peace. They are indeed frequently reproached with being agitators, fired by a disappointed ambition, and disturbers of the peace of the Church merely to gratify personal animosity, &c. We know them, and can unhesitatingly pronounce the reproach shamefully and maliciously false. We believe that those who reproach and malign them thus, know that the reproaches are unfounded and false. Dr. Schneck was no troubler in our Israel, and had no disappointed ambition to avenge. Dr. Ziegler, in York, never was a troubler in Israel, and has no disappointed ambition to avenge. The same is true of the Professors at Tiffin, and of the whole Band of Ger-



man brethren, who with but very few exceptions are opposed to and are opposing the innovations of Mercersburg Theology. And as for ourselves, the time, occasion, and circumstances of our first open opposition to that evil movement flatly contradict the mean imputation, and prove it absurdly untrue.

But let the matter be tested. Let the Professors at Lancaster give satisfactory evidence that they have seen their mistake, and let them openly, frankly renounce their errors; let them come out and as earnestly, as vigorously teach and defend the old faith of the church, as they have for years been assailing it; and then see how promptly our warfare against them will cease, and how cordially we will all rally to their support. Then they will soon discover how utterly groundless and false their calumnies of disappointed ambition have been, and how greatly they erred in judging others, in this regard, by themselves.

Until then, however, no weariness of the struggle shall tempt us to cease "contending for the faith once delivered to the saints."

---

#### I FEEL IT PULL.

In the deepening twilight of a summer evening, a pastor called at the residence of one of his parishioners, and saw seated in the doorway a little boy with both hands extended upwards, holding a line. "What are you doing here, my little friend?" inquired the minister. "Flying my kite, sir," was the prompt reply. "Flying your kite!" exclaimed the pastor; "I can see no kite—you can see none." "I cannot see it, but I know it is there, for I *feel it pull*."

A few years back the angels came and bore far above us out of our sight, one that was very dear to us all. The attachment of heart was not broken. The connecting ties were lengthened, not broken. We loved her while here, we love her still. She loved us while in the flesh. We are sure that she loves us none the less in her new condition. Rising higher and still higher in the heaven of heavens, we *feel her influence*. She is with Christ, and attracted by gentle influences we are tending toward her peaceful home, with the prospect of the same glorious companionship.—*Earnest Worker.*

## Ursinus College Repertory.

---

### LEARNING TO THINK,

BY THE AUTHOR OF "FRIENDS IN COUNCIL."

\* SIMPLE as the word *think*, in its pure Saxon form, seems to be, and fully as its meaning is commonly supposed to be understood, no one has ever tried to define or explain the matter without realizing the difficulty of doing so in a truly satisfactory way. And still fewer may really have observed how hard it is to think to some purpose, or how greatly every one needs to *learn to think*.

Dr. Carl Daub, the favorite philosophical Professor of our honored and favorite Instructor, Dr. Rauch, devotes forty of the most interesting pages of his Anthropology to this subject, and even then seems hardly satisfied with the result.

A chief aim of every student should be to acquire by diligent discipline, efficient skill in the exercise of his power of thought, carefully distinguishing it from a merely mechanical acquisition of such knowledge as books or lectures may impart. And no teacher understands the first principles of his vocation or his work, who does not strive by all suitable methods to incite his pupils to think.

The following essay and dialogue upon this subject, selected from a number of "Good Words," edited by Norman McLeod, D. D., will be found pertinent, and repay a careful perusal:

How to think—that is the subject of the following essay. It is a tentative essay. In general, I suppose that an essay-writer has made up his mind what he means to say before he begins to say it. But it is not so in the present case; and the writer will be prepared to allow his reader not merely to cry "halves," but three-fourths, or nine-tenths, if any success should attend his reading of this essay.

It must, I should think, be admitted that there is no waste in the world so great as the waste of thought; and he who should be



able to show how this waste is produced, and how any part of it may be avoided, cannot be accused of having wasted his time or thought in the consideration of so important a subject. Clear thought is the only sure source of wise action.

I have sometimes imagined that the use of bold metaphors might enable us to consider this subject appropriately, and have said to myself, the first thing is to look straight at the object you wish to master in thought. This, of itself, is a great difficulty, for how few of us do look straight, intellectually speaking! On further consideration, moreover, one sees that the foregoing is an insufficient metaphor; for, between us and the object of our consideration, how many things, not only solids, but perplexing phantoms, intervene! Amongst them are what Bacon calls the "Idols of the Mind," in which he enumerates the false appearances imposed upon us by every individual man's own nature and custom—the false appearances imposed upon us by words—the false conclusions arrived at, because "to the nature of the mind of all men it is consonant for the affirmative, or active, to effect more than the negative, or privative," and the like. To these idols I would add another, which I think has never been sufficiently considered when taking account of the bewilderments and errors of the human mind. It is that men are almost invariably charmed by difficulty. They overrate immensely the inherent value of that, whatever it may be, which presents difficulty to them. You may note this as appertaining to all classes of men. The lawyer will dwell upon some nice subtlety which affects only one-twentieth part of his client's case, to the neglect of those broad facts which govern the remaining nineteen-twentieths. The historian pesters his reader, and embarrasses the main course of his narrative, by dwelling upon some unimportant fact, or series of facts, which, as it has caused him much trouble to get to the bottom of, he must inflict upon other people. I should be erring in the same direction if because I have studied the question of the effect of difficulty upon men's minds, I should cumber this essay with the many instances whereby I could illustrate the ill-effects of the error in question.

But, after all, the real difficulty of thinking severely, and attaining the object of our thought, is that we admit far too many, both of our own previous thoughts, and of other men's thoughts; and these for a hazy medium between us and the desired object of thought.

This very work of Bacon's, the "Advancement of Learning," which is assuredly one of the greatest works that has ever been written, might have been studied attentively, by one who wishes to think severely, and yet might only prove an embarrassment to him. Knowledge hinders thought of the kind that I mean. The critical faculty often hinders such thoughts. Even imagination is often a hindrance to such thought. To recur to metaphor, the aids which previous thoughts of your own, which the thoughts of other people, and which your imagination might give you, fail to produce the effect which might be hoped from them, because they are not brought to a focus. On the contrary, they lead you off in straight lines, under, or above, or aside, that which ought to be the main and exclusive object of your thought.

How true and how condemnatory is the expression we all use when we promise ourselves, or others, to think upon any subject, namely, that we will think *about* it! And we do think *about* it, and not at it, or to it.

Having already said so much about those things which will not, of a certainty, aid us in severe thought for a purpose, I will now venture, though with much diffidence, to put forward some suggestions as to those methods which might prove an aid to severe thinking.

The first, and perhaps the greatest, would be, to determine the exact object for thought aimed at. It would perhaps surprise most of us, if we were to observe with care how rarely we state to ourselves, with anything like accuracy, the precise object we wish to accomplish by thought. Often, after such observation, we should find that our object of thought combined two or three contradictory elements. It was a very happy expression of Dickens—"How not to do it;" and, if we looked honestly into the processes of our minds, we should often perceive that we have begun by such an insufficient or contradictory statement (even to ourselves) of our endeavor, that we have already insured the result of "how not to think it." I will give an illustration in practical life, which has always struck me as being very significant of the absurd way in which men combine contradictory endeavors. It is to be seen in the dial-plates of many public clocks. The one object should be that the passer-by should be able rapidly to ascertain the time. For this purpose, the strongest contrast of color and the clearest outline of form should be adopted. It is



not a case for ornamentation ; but the two principal clocks which I pass by daily are so disfigured and so blurred by ornamentation that I have to pause before I can ascertain the time ; and, if there is the slightest mist, the said clocks are utterly illegible. What a mistake has been made in the main object to be aimed at ! Exactly a similar error often occurs as regards the objects of thought which we place before our minds. We constantly combine what is irrelevant, or even what is absolutely inconsistent with the main purpose which we have set ourselves to think out.

In a word, simplicity as regards the object of our thought, is to be aimed at ; and that we should have thoroughly determined what is to be the purpose of our thought.

Then comes the next great endeavor to which we should devote ourselves ; it is, that there should be simplicity in the *processes* of our thinking. All these "Idols of the Mind," that we have been considering, should be set aside. But a great deal more than that is required to insure the requisite simplicity in the process of thinking. Our own previous thoughts are often most damaging. Now here comes in a subtlety which must be carefully considered. It is not only that our previous thoughts lead us astray, but they, lead us into a direction which often can only land us in disaster. For these previous thoughts, both of our own and other people, have been chiefly built upon precedent, the force of which precedent is entirely inapplicable to the new circumstances with which we have to deal. I must illustrate this. A great writer on agriculture has said—and I believe justly—that whenever we apply steam power to digging or ploughing, we are in great error if we suffer ourselves to keep the present action of spade or plough too much in our minds. Icarus, too, made a great mistake when he adopted the precedent of birds' wings for his aerial flight. Severe thought, when it is to lead to anything new, should avoid all precedents.

As a general rule, great thinkers have rarely let us into the secret of how they have been accustomed to think. But when they have been inventors, we have sometimes had an inkling of their mode of procedure. They have betrayed to us that it was what they call a "sudden thought." We may be nearly sure that their object of thought stood very clearly before them in their minds. Then came this "sudden thought, as they call it. But I suspect its potency was not in its suddenness, but in its being a

*disengaged* thought—a thought disentangled from the thoughts of other men, or even from previous thoughts of their own.

I would deduce from this that the chief art in severe thinking is the art of forgetting, or of ignoring all that has been previously said, done, or written by yourself and others in the matter. I can conceive that there should be a man who would be able to combine and bring to a focus all those extraneous thoughts, and should thus be able to attain to novelty of thought, without the perplexity engendered by knowledge, or rather by half-knowledge, or by the fancies of imagination, or by an ignoble doting upon antiquity, or by a slavish subserviency to incomplete precedent. But that man has rarely appeared upon the earth. And the main use of all that previous thought upon the subject can teach you is, that it may form a means of criticizing, purifying, enlarging, confining, or condemning your new thought.

Finally, in all I have said, I am reminded of what Sir Walter Scott, I believe, once so humorously observed with respect to fishing. "You see," he said, "a man come down to the river-side with all the apparatus and appliances with which piscatory skill and knowledge can furnish him. It is very delightful to see so much skill and knowledge applied to so simple a matter; but the man of skill and knowledge catches nothing, and is vexed and humiliated by seeing near him a little ragged boy who, with a crooked stick, reelless line, and crooked pin, pulls out fish after fish with a grinning delight at his superiority over his neighbor, the well-furnished fisherman." Now there is in this boy's proceedings something of the simplicity of object and endeavor which has led to the greatest results in the severe thinking of inventors, and other men who have greatly benefited mankind.

This brief essay was read by the author to three brothers, whose Christian names are George, John and Percy. George is an official man, John a lecturer on science in one of our colleges, and Percy a lawyer. After the essay had been read, the following conversation took place:

*Author.* Well, what do you think of my essay?

*Percy.* It is not an essay one would like to give an opinion about in a hurry. I must confess I have never thought about how I think.

*George.* Nor I.



*John.* I think I have thought about it; but have never come to any conclusion.

*Percy.* Of course you don't want praise; you want to hear objections. Now I have a very important objection to make, as it seems to me. You speak of severe thought devoted to some object of thought. But you have not limited your class of objects. All that you say does not apply in the least, according to my judgment, to severe thought devoted to the acquisition of knowledge. The hardest thing I ever attacked, was the first three sections of Newton, when at college. Your remarks and suggestions do not apply to that kind of work.

*Author.* No: I did not mean that they should.

*Percy.* Then I think you should have said so at the outset.

*George.* I knew perfectly well what he was aiming at; he meant new thought to be applied to difficult circumstances.

*Author.* You are a good fellow, George, and always inclined to take one's part if you can.

*George.* Don't be too sure of that. I have a great deal to say against you. Where I think you err, is in the anxiety you seem to manifest to get rid of previous knowledge and previous thought. Now I admit that one does not want previous thought to be bothering one, and interrupting one, when one is endeavoring to think out new thoughts for oneself; but whatever one has read, or heard, or thought about the question, had better be "to the fore," as the Irish say.

*Author.* No: that is exactly where I contend it should not be.

*John.* He is right, and you are right, George; but both of you only partially right, as it seems to me. I'll explain what I mean. I have not read much history; and, to tell the truth, I don't care to read any more of it. I have enough to do in another line. But I have always thought that the good to be got out of history consists not so much of previous examples to be rigidly applied, but of certain rules, principles, and ways of looking at things, which would come into the mind of an historian, if he were a good historian, and which might enable him to judge judiciously of the present affairs of the world. But his historical knowledge should not be to the fore (at any rate in detail) when he is endeavoring to think out a new thing.

*Percy.* It is evident that brother John favors our friend; and

indeed the essay struck me as more fitted for scientific men—for inventors—than for the rest of the world.

*Author.* I do not admit that. There are hundreds of instances in common life, when a man has to shape out an original course for himself or for others; and my remarks in the essay apply as much to him as to any scientific man.

I will give an instance. There is great novelty in the circumstances of the present war between France and Prussia. There have been several occasions in the course of the war when an important decision had to be taken by one side or the other. I contend that that decision would have been better taken by one who kept his mind free from historical precedent. What your brother George said about historical knowledge being to the fore, would, in my judgment, be very injurious to a man having to make such a decision. I admit that the principles and rules which a man may, almost unconsciously, have derived from reading history—resulting in historical tact, if I may so describe it—will be useful to him; but he must not become a slave to historical precedent; he must not conclude, for instance, that because a Republic did something long ago, it will do that something now. I may have gone too far in wishing to banish previous thought and knowledge; but I am persuaded that, in the majority of cases, it is more of a hindrance than an aid.

*Percy* I doubt.

*Author.* I wish to give you more instances by way of illustration. What is the meaning and intent of a fortress? It is that, comparatively speaking, a few men shall be able to fire off guns at a large body of men, the gunners remaining, for the most part, in shelter. Now attend to me. An ingenious man looks at the thing to be done, throwing aside for the moment all thoughts of how the thing has previously been done, and he makes a great invention. He says to himself, or I imagine he says to himself, and I have a right to imagine it, "All I want is to fire off a gun, and for the gun and myself to retire into shelter and to be almost invisible to the enemy." Consequently he digs a hole in the ground, places himself in it, contrives that after the gun has been fired, it shall drop down to him in the trench and be loaded again, and then ascend to be fired off again. That is Captain Moncrieff's invention.



*Percy.* This is scientific. I admit that a good deal of your essay might apply to inventors.

*Author.* No, not to inventors only. You know when one has any subject in one's mind how, whatever one reads or hears, seems to have a mysterious relation to this subject. I happened to take up the "Physical Theory of Another Life" the other day, and I came upon a passage which I will read to you:—"Those who addict themselves to the steady pursuit of truth, in any line of thought, are well aware of the disturbance and the disappointment that arise, notwithstanding the utmost efforts to the contrary; first, from the incessant intermixture of ideas foreign to the subject of which the mind is laboring to make itself master, and which irrelevant ideas take their rise from the principle of association; and then, secondly, from the mere spending of the force of the mind, that is to say of its *organic force*, just at the moment when abstract notions are coming into a position of intelligible relation, and when their correspondence is about to be perceived. The same process, taken up at another time, is not found to present precisely the same elements, or not in precisely the same proportions; the results, therefore, differ in the issue, by a little; and so we fail of the satisfaction of ascertaining truth. In such instances it is as if the furnace of the chemist, upon the continued intensity of which the success of a difficult experiment wholly depends, were supplied only with a niggard allowance of fuel, which is almost always burnt out before the ingredients in the crucible are completely assimilated." You see that this great writer has had a notion somewhat similar to mine, and has applied it in reference to the steady pursuit of truth in *any line of thought*.

*Percy.* I don't like talking any more about the subject until I have read the essay for myself. I have observed that a skillful reader, and every author is skillful when he reads his own writings, gains a great advantage by reading. He treads firmly upon the safe ground, and glides over what is shaky. I must have the essay to study for myself, if I am to take any further objections to it.

Here the conversation ended.

---

I WOULD not give one moment of heaven for all the joy and riches of the world, even if it lasted thousands of years.—*Luther.*

## SPECIAL COLLEGE ITEMS.

*Married*, November 10, 1874, in Myerstown, by the Rev. Geo. Wolff, D.D., Rev. F. S. Lindaman, pastor of the Blair charge, Perry county, Pa., to Miss Amelia J. Rice, of Loysville, Perry county.

Mr. Lindaman is the fourth of our graduates who has complied with one of the ethical counsels given in course. In common with those of his former fellows in study, whose example he has thus followed, he has the most cordial congratulations of the Faculty and his Alma Mater, collectively.

---

*As the close* of the long Fall Term of the College approaches, we have the usual interest of preparation for the anniversary which then occurs, and of which a special notice is subjoined. Our College societies are in active, healthy operation, and have recently displayed commendable zeal in fitting up their respective halls. Each with its new furniture presents an attractive appearance, and fully satisfies every reasonable demand of good taste and comfort. Having recently visited the halls, we could not help contrasting, in memory, the plain and homely accommodations with which the literary societies of our first acquaintance had to be content for many years after their organization. But the world moves more rapidly now than it did thirty-five years ago. Let it speed on, only so it keeps on the right track.

---

*The Third Anniversary* of the *Schaff Literary Society* will be celebrated on the evening of December 17, 1874, in the College Chapel. The following gentlemen will represent the occasion, viz.: *J. E. Groff, J. C. Johnson, F. C. Yost, D. V. Wolff, L. G. Kremer, D. W. Ebbert*. Music will be furnished under the efficient leadership of H. W. Kratz, Esq. The Society extends a cordial invitation to all, especially to those who are interested in its welfare and that of the Institution.

---

*Thanksgiving Day* (Nov. 26) was duly observed in the College. The Faculty and students participated in the Union services of the Trappe, *Reformed*, and Freeland, *Trinity*, congregations, in the handsomely repaired and enlarged church of the latter con-



gregation. The occasion was a delightful one, and seemed to be fully enjoyed by the large concourse of people in attendance.

In honor of the day the College steward had made specially liberal preparations for the dinner, which were appreciated with grateful zest.

---

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.—Received for Educational aid (Beneficiaries) from :

Rev. J. Sechler, Hanover.....	\$ 40 00
Rev. R. S. Appel, Hamburg.....	36 00
Rev. E. J. Fogel, Jordan charge .....	100 00
F. M. HOBSON, Treasurer, &c.	

*For Church Aid.*

Rev. R. S. Appel, Hamburg.....	\$ 17 53
Rev. J. Sechler.....	30 00

---

VARIOUS ITEMS.

*Council of College Presidents.*—An important council of the Presidents of nearly all the principal American colleges was held a few days since at Hanover, N. H. A correspondent of the *Springfield Republican* gives the following report of their proceedings :

“The principal subjects of discussion during the meeting have been college regattas and boating, taxation of college property, optional studies, comparative importance of classical and scientific studies and the college and the university systems. The discussion on college regattas was quite earnest. The feeling seemed to be that, though they possessed some evil influence, yet their evil influence is only in lowering the standing in their classes of those engaged, while the exercise increases the general standing of the college itself; moreover, that if regattas were discountenanced, boating would be weakened and an important means of physical culture abandoned. It was resolved not to interfere in the matter in any way.

“Taxation of college property was denounced severely. President Chadbourne, of Williams, argued that, if the present

Massachusetts law were repealed, Williams College would have to pay \$6,000 a year, which would necessitate the dismissal of at least two professors. He stated that, if the matter comes before the Legislature next winter, he shall use every effort to defeat any change. President Eliot said that Harvard was interested in the matter to the extent of some \$60,000, which it would be taxed in case the law was repealed. The feeling was unanimous in favor of the present law, at least so far as it relates to educational societies.

"President Eliot argued in favor of optional studies, stating that this is the only country which compels a student to study prescribed branches after the age of nineteen. At Harvard great liberty is allowed in this regard. A man should not, indeed, have the opportunity to elect his course before he is of sufficient maturity to know the comparative benefits of each study, but this can apply only to the students under eighteen or nineteen years; after this they ought to have option. He was opposed to some extent by President Porter, of Yale. Classical and scientific studies were then compared, and each side had its advocates. President Robinson, of Brown, urged the greater importance of the classics. The general opinion was, that the languages and sciences should be studied as means of mental discipline only during Freshman and Sophomore years; the succeeding years—Junior and Senior—should be devoted to philosophy, literature, and special sciences, leaving the languages and mathematics optional during the junior year."—*Christian Statesman*.

---

*The Peabody Fund.*—Of the fund given by Mr. Peabody for promoting education in the Southern States, the amount now available, is in round numbers two million dollars, yielding an annual income of \$120,000. When the trust was first created, not a single Southern State had a modern system of public schools, now no State is without such a system, existing at least in law, and every State has already either organized or is now organizing the schools. Of course the credit of creating all these public schools does not belong exclusively to the Peabody fund; but without it some of the States would not have any schools at all, and few of them would be in their present flourishing condition. The great pressing need was primary education for the masses, and by making appropriations only for the assistance of free pub-



lic schools, the great object of Mr. Peabody's noble benefaction was best attained. The money is not given as a charity to the poor, nor in proportion to the comparative destitution of any community, but only to those who help themselves; it is required that all schools aided shall have at least a hundred pupils, with one teacher for every fifty, shall be properly graded, and shall be continued during ten months in the year, with an average attendance of not less than 85 per cent. The most that is given to a school of a hundred pupils is \$300; to one of two hundred \$600, and so on; but this always on condition that the district shall pay at least twice, and usually much more than twice the amount given from the Peabody fund.

## EDITORS' DESK.

**BUSINESS NOTICES.**—*After the receipt of this number of the Monthly, subscribers will please remit the amount due to JOHN H. PEARSOL, ESQ., LANCASTER, PA. They can do so either by POSTAL ORDER on Lancaster, or by Bank Check. All in arrears are earnestly urged to be prompt in paying up.*

*The Reformed Church Monthly for 1875.*—Taking lessons from the exemplary zeal of other publications, we solicit our friends to make suitable efforts for increasing the circulation of the MONTHLY, and so enlarging its sphere of usefulness. Now is a good time to put forth efforts for this purpose, so that it may start its eighth year with January, 1875, encouraged by the results of such efforts.

If all who have assured us of their warm approval of its principles, aims and course, and have appreciated the service it has rendered to the cause it advocates, will lay hold of the matter, it would be easy to secure one thousand additional subscribers.

To stimulate them, if needful, to make the attempt, we offer the following special terms, for the next three months: We will furnish new subscribers—

6 copies for 1875, (exclusive of postage,) for.....				\$10 00
12	"	"	"	..... 19 00
20	"	"	"	..... 30 00

and all above 20 copies on the same terms. Those who subscribe now will receive the November and December numbers gratuitously.

The MONTHLY does not pretend to take the place of *The Christian World*, our weekly religious paper. But in the main, they work hand in hand, each meeting a want in its own way. The MONTHLY furnishes articles of permanent value, and can be easily preserved for future reference.

Back numbers and volumes can be furnished. Single numbers (postage prepaid) 20 cents. Back volumes (postage prepaid) \$2.00.

#### REASONS FOR TAKING IT.

It is a monthly periodical of 56 pages, making a volume of 672 pages a year, which can be easily preserved and bound at the end of the year.


*Its great object* is to set forth, maintain and defend, the long settled faith and practice of the Reformed church, the principles and doctrines of the church, and to do this in opposition to all efforts made to change both and to introduce high-church, sacerdotal, ritualistic and Romanizing errors.

*In its matter and style* it may be called a practical, popular review, calculated to instruct the reader upon subjects of vital importance, to strengthen them in the faith, and to warn and fortify them against deceitful and misleading errors.

*Every member of the Reformed Church* should take it. It supplies them with substantial and profitable articles, such as are not usually published in a weekly paper.

*It costs* but \$2 a year, and for that sum gives more original reading matter than any other religious monthly we know of.

*Try it* for one year, and, like nearly all others who have done so, and love the old faith more than attempted innovations, you will hardly give it up.

 *By the new postage law, which will go into operation on January 1st, 1875, publishers must prepay on all matter sent to subscribers. Our friends will please, therefore, add 12 cents to the price of the Monthly to cover this extra item of expense. It will be a small thing for them, but the aggregate will be of account to us.*

*With the present number* the "Reformed Church Monthly" closes its seventh volume. Although this has been the Sabbatical year of its existence, the persistent warfare of those who have arrayed themselves against the "ground and foundation" of the apostolic faith of the Reformed Church, has not allowed the *Monthly* to lay aside its weapons and rest, at least from its contest against invading errors. But whilst thus compelled to continue "fighting the good fight of faith," other claims have not been neglected. Like Nehemiah and his loyal associates, the *Monthly* has labored earnestly to repair and strengthen the foundations and the walls, even whilst repelling the assaults of foes. A review of the *table of contents* for the year will show how much has been done in this way. Our work has not been merely negative, but most positive also; fully as much so, and in a far better Reformed sense, as that of those who try to make people believe that they are preëminently the teachers of a positive theology, that their *noes* always mean *yeas*.



Doubtless there are those, even among the sincere friends of the "good old faith" of our church, who long for a truce to this "thirty years' war." We not only sympathise with their longing, but go further: we desire the war to be brought wholly to an end. A mere *truce*, a mere suspension of the conflict would be deceptive and perilous, at this time, to the cause of evangelical truth. Those who have forced the contest upon the church by their Romish errors, well understand this. Hence their whining for peace. It would lull the now aroused sense of the church to existing dangers and it would give the advocates of ritualistic innovations time to recover strength.

Greatly as peace may be desired, the time for it has not yet quite come. It must be conquered by ridding the church of the heretical elements of discord which have stealthily crept in, and the true character of which has been so artfully concealed, that they are only now beginning to be fairly discovered.

As, therefore, the painful necessity which called forth the MONTHLY still lingers among us, it must continue its work a little longer. Let the true friends of the "old faith" stand by it in the future as they have done in the past, and the Lord "will give His people peace" in truth triumphant.

*An esteemed brother*, one most sincerely and intelligently devoted to the Church and its Gospel principles, sends in the following:

*Editors Reformed Church Monthly*: I noticed in the *Messenger* of October 28, at the close of an article under "Theology and Criticism," a remarkable paragraph. The writer sees no objection to holding it as an *opinion*, that there will be a day of grace *after death*, for unbaptized infants and heathen. In other words, there will be for such an *intermediate state of probation*. Does not this hypothesis involve the Romish error of a "*limbus infantum*?" And will not the mere *holding*, and public advocacy, of such a notion by one of our Theological professors, influence his students as certainly as if he positively taught it?

Besides, did not the Board of Visitors of our Seminary, some twenty years ago, *report* to the Synod, convened in Carlisle, one of the Professors for having published the above hypothesis as his opinion, and require the Professor to retract? Will our Synod *now* quietly permit its Professors to proclaim such vain speculations?

*A Subscriber.*

The erroneous "opinion" named might well arrest attention, on the ground stated by "Subscriber." But the worst of the matter is, the very specious way in which it is put, namely, under a sort of *tender plea* for poor *infants* (no doubt they mean such as die without baptism, so as to ease off their doctrine of baptismal regeneration) and poor *heathen*. The sympathy, sentimental emotion, thus aroused, is likely to keep most persons from noticing how the erroneous "opinion" overthrows a fundamental principle of the Gospel, and paves the way for more of that *Universalism* which is said to be spreading so rapidly over the land. For, if a future state of probation is to be reserved for infants and heathen, why not extend its advantages to others? Why limit them at all?

But more of this hereafter.

*The rumor, or rather information received*, of another apostasy from the

Lancaster-Mercersburg party to Popery, published in the November *Monthly*, was credited for several reasons.

1. *The information came so directly from a source which every one would regard as reliable, and as likely to be fully possessed of the facts in the case, that there was sufficient reason to believe it correct.*

2. So many apostasies to Rome from that party have already taken place, that a new defection had nothing remarkable in it, to make the information at all improbable in itself.

3. The anti-Protestant and Popish character and tendency of the views and practices advocated or countenanced by the party in question, renders such apostasies easy, likely, and logical events.

If under such circumstances a sister tells a friend that her brother has gone over to the Reformed Church, would not the statement be considered worthy of credit?

Having, therefore, adequate reasons for crediting the information received, it was felt to be due to the Christian public to report the item as it appeared.

Since its publication a letter has reached us from one of the students of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, who supposes the item referred to himself, in which, among other things, he says:

"I am happy to assure you, Sir, that the distance between myself and the figurative, spiritual 'Rome' is greater, by leagues and leagues of analogously symbolical miles, than that between myself and the literal 'home of the Cæsars.'"

This is no doubt intended as a denial of the correctness of the item referred to. We cheerfully give our young friend the advantage of its publication.

In confirmation of reasons 2 and 3 given above, the following list of apostasies and defections (so far as known to us, or as now remembered) is here-with republished for the information of our readers, and all interested in this sad chapter in the recent history of our Reformed Church:

*Apostasies to Rome.*

*David Snively*, a licentiate of Mercersburg Classis.

*Peter Coblenz*, a student at Mercersburg.

*Rev. Moses A. Stewart* (and wife), formerly of Burketville, Md.

*Rev. John Wagner* (and wife), formerly of Pittsburg, Pa.

*Miss* ——— Hagerstown, Md.

" " " Easton, Pa.

" " " Lancaster, Pa.

*Rev. George Dering Wolff* (and wife), Norristown, Pa.

*Rev. John S. Ermentrout*, formerly of Norristown, Pa.

*Prof. Charles Budd*, not a member of the Reformed Church, but a student of Mercersburg, and at the time of his apostasy, a professor in Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

*John Oliver*, Esq., (a nephew of the Drs. Apple), of Allentown, Pa.

*Rev. E. O. Forney*, of Norristown, Pa.



*Rev. William Phillips*, formerly pastor in Mercersburg. He first joined the Episcopal Church, and then took the full step.

*Defections to the (Puseyite) Episcopal Church.*

*Rev. Aaron Christman*, formerly of Huntingdon, Pa.

*Lewis Zahner*, while a student at Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.

—— *Nevin*, son of Dr. J. W. Nevin, Lancaster.

*Rev. Robert Nevin*, son of Dr. J. W. Nevin, now in the Episcopal Church in Rome.

*Miss* ——— Lancaster, Pa.

*Rev. S. H. Giesy, D.D.* (and wife), formerly of Christ Church, Philadelphia.

After the two preceding items were written, the *Messenger* of November 25 arrived, with a characteristic allusion to the "rumor," in the department of the Lancaster Professors' "Theological and Critical." Only a few of the characteristically specious and evasive points they make can now be noticed.

They say "the report is a pure fabrication."—So far as we, or our informant are concerned, this assertion is positively untrue. And nothing but personal regard for the relations of the party concerned keeps back the proof.

Further, they say "there is just nothing at all in it."—If they can affirm this squarely, without any mental reservations, they are ignorant of some facts with which they might be acquainted; and there are some things to be explained in regard to the rumor which may yet be cleared up.—But let it be remembered here, that similar assertions were made in regard to the apostasy of some *who did go over from their party to the Romish Church.*

It would have been better for the cause of the Professors if they had stopped with the above unwarranted assertions. But they have ventured rashly to make others, which are so obviously at variance with truth and well known facts, that they utterly invalidate any force their previous declarations might have with interested or uninformed persons, and show how unreliable their testimony is in such matters.

Thus they affirm: "The teachings in the Seminary are a continual protection and defence against the errors of Rome."—In a case less grave, this might be taken as a joke. But think of their making such a declaration in the face, 1, of the Romish doctrine which they teach (on the Church, the Sacraments, ordination, priestly absolution, &c.), and, 2, in the face of the testimony of such students of theirs, and for a long time zealous partisans with them, as G. D. Wolff, Esq., J. H. Wagner, J. S. Ermentrout, &c.—"*Protection and Defence!*" But for the teachings and influence of the Seminary, there is every reason to believe that those gentlemen would be in the ministry of our Church to-day. Is it a slander to say that they were zealous disciples of the theology of the Seminary, and that through that theology they were first turned away from Protestantism toward Popery?

The other points must be laid over for next month.

*Another Witness.*—Prof. *Fritschel*, the ultra-Lutheran of Iowa, a warm

eulogist of Nevinism, in another, recent article, on Mercersburg theology, says :

"Just as our old *Lutheran* teachers, in *contending against the Reformed*, vindicated the *theanthropic* life of Jesus, by insisting that the "I" (Ego), in such passages as, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," was not limited to His divine nature, but included the human also; in like manner do the Nevinites maintain, in opposition to their antagonists, that this "I" includes the real presence of both natures. In the sentence, "I am the bread of life," the human nature of Christ is included as well as the divine. It is the one indivisible *theanthropic life of Jesus Christ* which is communicated to us."

Prof. F. carries out the agreement between Lutheranism and Nevinism with further illustrations, which we have not space to quote, and closes his article with the hope that by the success of the Nevinite movement in the Reformed church, its union with the Lutheran may be ultimately secured. Only he is somewhat staggered by a peculiar distortion of the *doctrine of the atonement* in the Mercersburg theory.

---

*The challenge* which our readers will remember has been pressed upon Lancaster for the last two or three months, is declined by the Lancaster Professors.

Dr. Gerhart refuses to publish the whole of Dr. Schneck's letter. He shrinks from exposing the deception practised in giving but a brief extract from it.

Dr. J. W. Nevin, after maligning the book of Dr. Schneck as a travesty and as containing garbled extracts, shrinks from attempt to support his accusation by proof. He knows he cannot do it. The accusation is utterly false.

Both are now left to the just judgment of honest public sentiment, and a still more solemn assize in the future.

In his whole book Dr. Schneck has not made one false issue, or charged Nevinism with a single error, which is not proven to be taught by it.

---

*The Editor of the Eastern Department of "The Christian World"* recently published a full matter-of-fact refutation of the malicious slander which he says some Lancaster zealots are still circulating regarding our alleged disappointments in ecclesiastical expectations. For the service thus kindly volunteered, the editor has our sincere thanks, especially as it may help to frustrate the main purpose of those who lend themselves to such unworthy acts, namely, to injure the cause we are trying to serve.

But if Brother Reid hopes to convince the men who traffic in such merchandise that they are in error, and to induce them to drop the trade, he does not know them as well as we do. A partisan agent who could tell one of our Ursinus professors that he (the agent) considered any artifice justifiable in warfare, and who had given proof of the Jesuitical ethics by practice, would of course rather believe and circulate a falsehood than have it corrected, if some party end could be thus secured. Most, if not all, the persons guilty of the



wrong exposed in the *World*, have long known the facts in the case, and know that an incident which occurred in *October, 1863*, could not have prompted opposition which began and was carried on for nearly or quite three years previously, as published records prove.—It may be well, however, for the sake of friends who were not acquainted with the facts in the case, that they have been published. They can now see to what lengths Lancaster theology allows its disciples to go, in seeking to uphold a bad cause. Such calumnious assaults upon private character are fit weapons for a party which is seeking by stealth to overthrow the faith of a church.

*The friends of the Monthly* will remember that it must depend for patronage, increased circulation and support, upon their individual efforts. What is done for it is done for themselves and for their cause. Let all assist.

*All articles not signed, are from the pen of the Senior Editor. Others are furnished by responsible contributors.*

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

We again call attention to the advertisement of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, published in November.

*The National Sunday School Teacher* for December is an admirable number, containing many valuable articles. Published by the Adams, Blackmer & Lyon Publishing Company, Chicago. \$1.50 a year.

The *Kirchenzeitung*, Philadelphia, Rev. N. Gehr, D.D., editor, will be published, after January 1, 1875, every two weeks, at \$1.00 a year. It is an excellent German paper, and should be liberally sustained.

The *Reformed Church Almanac* for 1875, published at the office of the *Christian World*, is ready for distribution.

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

*Lebanon, Pa.*, first church, Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D., pastor. At the German and English communion, held on November 15 and 22, both occasions were attended by a larger number of communicants than at any previous times; and the attendance was beyond the capacity of the church. Confirmed, 45, including 13 heads of families, and 13 adult baptisms. In addition 11 were received by certificate. Total, 56. The services were unusually solemn, and it may be hoped equally blessed in their spiritual influences.



The dedication services of the new Union Church at Shillington (near Reading), took place on Saturday and Sunday, November 14 and 15. It was our pleasant privilege to assist Rev. M. L. Fritsch, pastor of the Reformed congregation, on the occasion. The church is a very neat and comfortable building, 40x60 feet in dimensions, and will seat about 400 persons. All the services were well attended, and that on Sunday afternoon attracted such numbers that scarcely one-half could get into the edifice. The assiduous labors of Mr. Fritsch are warmly appreciated, and it has been very gratifying to find him meeting with such cheering success.

The meeting of the Union Committees of the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church, and the several synods of our own branch, took place in Philadelphia on Wednesday, November 18. Of the five committees of our Synods all the members were present but Br. Martin, of the Synod of the Northwest. The meeting was in every respect a pleasant one, excepting that it failed as to the main object. One practical hindrance to a union of the two churches at this time appeared to be, that the Reformed Church in America (the Dutch Church) could not see its way clear to abate its demand of subscription to the Belgic Confession, and the canons of Dort, in addition to the Heidelberg Catechism. But the main obstacle, after all, seemed to exist in the difficulties existing in our branch of the church, on account of the agitation of the peculiarities of Mercersburg theology. The following account of the meeting, and the report adopted, finally, as the expression of the results reached, we copy from the *Philadelphia Ledger*. The matter naturally prompts some remarks, but it may be better to forbear, and let the regretted issue with the chief cause of it, to work their own moral result. The case teaches our Church some solemn lessons. May they be heeded in time.

*The Proposed Union between the Branches of the Reformed Church.*—The joint committee appointed by the Synods of the Reformed Church in the United States, formerly the German Reformed, and the Reformed Church in America, formerly the Dutch Reformed, to consider the expediency of organic union between the two bodies, continued its session in the First German Reformed Church, Race street, below Fourth, yesterday morning. Rev. Dr. E. V. Gerhart and Rev. Dr. H. D. Ganse, Chairmen of the respective committees, acted as joint Chairmen.

The following is the sub-committee appointed under the resolution adopted on the previous day to draw up resolutions indicating the conclusions arrived at in the joint sessions: Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D.D., Rev. J. O. Miller, D.D., and Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D., representing the Committee of the German Church; and Rev. H. D. Ganse, D.D., Rev. A. B. Van Zandt, D.D., and Rev. W. J. R. Taylor, D.D., representing the Committee of the Dutch Church.

The sub-committee presented the following report, which was read by the Rev. Dr. Ganse:

The Committees of Conference appointed by the General Synods of the Reformed Church in the United States, and the Reformed Church in America, met in Philadelphia on the morning of November 18th, 1874, and spent in joint session the greater part of that and the forenoon of the following day.



After a very free and brotherly interchange of information concerning the organization, symbols, doctrinal sentiments and usages of the two denominations, the committees agreed upon the following statement of the results of their conference:

1. Such large and obvious elements of likeness and sympathy as exist between the two bodies seem to point very plainly to ultimate union between them. They are almost identical in name as in origin and in early history. Their ecclesiastical organization and nomenclature of consistory, classis, Synod and General Synod are substantially the same. One venerable symbol, the Heidelberg Catechism, is held in common in the two denominations. The body of doctrine which either church derives from this common symbol, of necessity has close and fundamental resemblances. The committee have found, moreover, a perfect unity of method and spirit in the devotional acts which they have performed together; and their whole interview has reminded them of the essential unity of their work of caring for those continental Christians of the Reformed faith who are so widely distributed over the newer parts of our country. With these and similar points of contrast between them, the committees cannot believe that the two bodies will abide apart.

2. The Committees have further found with gratification, that some elements of seeming difference between their two denominations have, upon fuller information concerning them, lost much of their apparent importance. In particular, the usage of confirmation prevails in the Reformed Church in the United States, and is unknown in the Reformed Church in America, but, as it is interpreted in the constitution of the first-named Church, it is plain that it may fully consist with the principles and methods by which the other church admits her baptized youth to full communion. It does not appear, therefore, that the continuance of that usage on the one side, or abstinence from it on the other, ought to be a decisive obstacle to union. The observance of festal religious days in the Reformed Church in the United States, though very general, is not enjoined, and therefore stands upon the same footing with the same observance as it prevails, though to a less extent, in the Reformed Church in America. Even such diversities as may exist in the matter of liturgical services, so long as they might not be seen to turn upon important differences of doctrinal belief, might be harmoniously adjusted. The committee, indeed, have little doubt that all the minor elements of difference which have grown up in the two churches during their separated life, could either be softened or accommodated in a cordial and intelligent attempt to bring these Reformed Churches under a single banner.

3. The Committees, however, are constrained to say, that some other obstacles to union seem to be of a less manageable character. The most patent of these lies in the fact that, while both of these denominations accept the Heidelberg Catechism, the Reformed Church in America adds to this symbol the Belgic Confession and the canons of the Synod of Dort. In order, therefore, to an organic union of the two bodies, the one or the other would be compelled to make a material change in its doctrinal standards. Since neither Committee finds itself prepared to advise its Synod to make so important a concession, they



can only agree in making a frank statement of this difficulty, in the hope that time and the best wisdom of the two denominations, and, above all, the Providence of God, may direct to its just solution.

In addition to this, the probable fact that a body made up of these two denominations would include important differences in doctrinal views and ecclesiastical feeling, has appeared during the conference. These obstacles seem to preclude any further negotiations in the direction of organic union. The committees, in conclusion, are fully persuaded that, although their interview has developed no plan or distinct prospect of the organic union of their two Churches, a real advance toward that most desirable result has been made in the frank and friendly conference which has now been held.

The difficulty of merging denominations so old and well established as these, could not be expected to be small. It is something gained to be able to see at what point the obstacles are greatest. Not less valuable is that cultivation of brotherly acquaintance, esteem and sympathy, which this Conference has greatly furthered. The ultimate issue of their interview the committee entrust to Christ, the one head of the one universal Church, in the faith that He has kindled in these sister denominations the desire of union, and that He will not suffer that desire to fail.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.—The missionary *Link* publishes a letter from miss Chase, of Calcutta, in which she says that not less than twenty missionaries and native helpers preach every morning and evening in the different bazars of that heathen city.

*Wong Chin Soo* is announced by the Unitarians of Salem, Mass., as "the first Confucian missionary to the United States." He preached in one of their churches on a recent Sunday evening, and a collection was made in aid of his "mission."

The Rev. Dr. Vail, Bishop of the Kansas Episcopalians, is groping towards the light. That was a splendid idea which he advanced in his recent annual address to his people. He said: "I plead that this church shall be modeled upon the idea of God's Great One Church—with so much of liberty and of diversity in it, that it may take in all of God's people within the limits of God's revealed truth."

On March 28th, 1874, the 4th Martyrs' Memorial Church was dedicated in Madagascar. The church is built on the rock Ampamarinana, from which fourteen confessors were thrown, while four were being burned to death elsewhere, on that very day twenty-five years before. About 2,000 persons, among them some who had suffered in the persecution, united in this dedication.

Mr. A. H. Ward boasts that confession is practised in the Church of England far more widely than the bishops know, and he intimates obliquely that a good many of the bishops do not know what is going on in their dioceses. One "priest" in London is said to have heard thirteen hundred confessions in one year.